Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. March 1890.

CONFIDENTIAL.

F.O. (5900.) Turkey 162

424

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE

RESPECTING

ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS

IN THE

ASIATIC PROVINCES OF TURKEY.

[In continuation of Confidential Paper No. 5764.]

162

1889.

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. March 1890.

CONFIDENTIAL.

(5900.)

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE

RESPECTING

ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS

IN THE

ASIATIC PROVINCES OF TURKEY.

[In continuation of Confidential Paper No. 5764.]

1889.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
1	Sir W. White ..	517	Dec. 29, 1888	Sentence passed on Armenian school teacher at Erzeroum	1
2	„ „ ..	2	Jan. 2, 1889	Recent troubles in Hekkiari. Forwards preliminary Report on by Colonel Chermside. Colonel Bell's information respecting Nestorians	2
3	Evangelical Alliance ..	..	10,	Case of Nicolaki Effendi. Forwards extract from letter from their Committee in Constantinople	4
4	Memorandum by Colonel Bell	..	14,	Recent events in Hekkiari, and condition of Nestorians	5
5	Mersina, Tarsus, and Adana Railway Company	..	17,	Financial straits of their railway. If nothing is done it will probably fall into French hands	6
6	To Sir W. White ..	24	21,	Case of Nicolaki Effendi. Copy of No. 3 ..	7
7	To Evangelical Alliance	..	21,	Case of Nicolaki Effendi. Copy of No. 3 will be sent to Constantinople with reference to previous instructions	7
8	Evangelical Alliance ..	..	22,	Case of Nicolaki Effendi. Nicolaki now released, but not allowed to return to his home	7
9	To Sir W. White ..	26	22,	Mersina, Tarsus, and Adana Railway. Copy of No. 5, for observations	8
10	To Mersina, Tarsus, and Adana Railway Company	..	22,	Mersina, Tarsus, and Adana Railway. Acknowledges receipt of No. 5	8
11	Sir W. White ..	10 Confidential	15,	The Armenians and the Porte. Conversation between Armenian Patriarch and Mr. Marinitch	8
12	„ „ ..	14	17,	Expedition sent by Damascus authorities against certain Bedouin tribes. Despatch from Consul Dickson	9
13	„ „ ..	27	20,	Disturbances in Zab Valley. Despatches from Colonel Chermside and Mr. Devey ..	9
14	To Sir W. White ..	34	26,	Armenian political exiles. Approves course proposed	12
15	Evangelical Alliance ..	..	Feb. 1,	Nicolaki Effendi He has now been permitted to return hom . Thanks for assistance ..	12
16	To Evangelical Alliance	..	6,	Nicolaki Effendi. Expresses satisfaction at result attained in this case	12
17	Sir W. White ..	56	7,	Alleged desecration of churches in Mahmoudi. Despatch from Vice-Consul at Van ..	13
18	„ „ ..	64	12,	Disturbances in Zab Valley. Further Report from Vice-Consul Devey	13
19	„ „ ..	71 Confidential	15,	Mersina, Tarsus, and Adana Railway Company. Observations respecting position of ..	14
20	Archbishop of Canterbury	..	25,	Relations between Kurds and Nestorians. Thanks for letter of the 29th January. Observations respecting	15
21	„ „	..	27,	Position of Nestorian Christians. Thanks for perusal of Mr. Devey's despatch of the 9th January	15
22	To Sir W. White ..	68	28,	Relations between Kurds and Nestorians. Copy of No. 20. To call upon Mr. Russell for a Report	16
23	Sir W. White ..	75 Confidential	22,	Persecution of Armenians. Conduct of authorities at Van. Has taken steps to bring to knowledge of Sultan	16
24	„ „ ..	92 Confidential	Mar. 2,	History of family of Notables named Temir Oglou at Van. Despatch from Vice-Consul Devey	18
25	To Sir W. White ..	85	9,	Persecution of Armenians at Van. Approves his having brought to knowledge of Sultan ..	21
26	„ „ ..	109	29,	Newspaper "Haiasdan" and the Armenians. Conversation of Sir James Fergusson with Rustem Pasha	21
27	Sir W. White ..	115	23,	Appointment of Raif Pasha as Governor-General of Beyrout	22

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
28	Sir W. White ..	124	Mar. 29, 1889	Relations between Kurds and Nestorians. Forwards Report asked for from Vice-Consul Russell	23
29	„ „ ..	142	Apr. 13,	Election of Protestant Vekil. Difficulties terminated with appointment of Mr. Boyadjian. Memoranda by Mr. Block respecting	23
30	To Sir W. White ..	152	22,	Mr. Block's Memorandum respecting Protestant community in Turkey. Thanks for	27
30*	Sir W. White ..	163	30,	Complaint against Mutessarif of Hekkiari by inhabitants of Bashkaleh. Despatch from Mr. Devey	27A
31	Prince Malcom Khan ..	..	May 14,	Atrocities in Armenia. Complains of statement that they are due to tribes coming from Persia	27
32	Sir W. White ..	26 Telegraphic	26,	Moussa Bey. Telegram from Colonel Chermside respecting reports of outrages committed by	28
33	To Sir W. White ..	31 Telegraphic	29,	Moussa Bey. To make representations to Porte as soon as he gets Colonel Chermside's despatch	28
34	„ „ ..	190	29,	Extends above	28
35	Sir W. White ..	183	20,	Reported outrages by Moussa Bey. Conversation with Sultan. His Majesty's appreciation of Lord Salisbury's reply to Lord Carnarvon	28
36	„ „ ..	190	24,	Appointment of Rashad Pasha as Governor of Jerusalem. Particulars respecting his career	29
37	„ „ ..	192	25,	Reported outrages near Moush. Difficulty of obtaining information. Suggests sending Colonel Chermside to inquire into ..	30
38	„ „ ..	193 Confidential	26,	Insecurity in Van and Bitlis Vilayets. Telegram from Colonel Chermside	31
39	„ „ ..	194 Confidential	27,	Colonel Chermside inquires whether he should visit district of Nestorian Christians. Despatch from him	31
40	„ „ ..	28 Telegraphic	June 2,	Moussa Bey reported on his way to Constantinople	32
41	„ „ .	201	2,	Extends above	33
42	„ „ ..	197 Secret	May 30,	Moussa Bey and his outrages. Despatches from Colonel Chermside and Mr. Devey reporting on	33
43	To Sir W. White ..	32 Telegraphic	June 4,	Moussa Bey and his outrages. May send Colonel Chermside as he proposes. He should not visit Nestorians	35
44	Sir W. White ..	199	2,	Moussa Bey's outrages. Despatch from Mr. Devey, with letter from Mr. Knapp, a missionary	35
45	„ „ ..	202	2,	Moussa Bey's outrages. Statement made to Sir A. Saudison by Sultan's First Secretary. Representations made to Sultan	37
46	„ „ ..	208	5,	Armenian affairs. Transfer of Mutessarif of Hekkiari. Consular despatches reporting on	38
47	„ „ ..	213	10,	Proceedings and movements of Moussa Bey. Further respecting from Mr. Devey and Rev. Mr. Knapp	45
47*	To Sir W. White ..	208	18,	Proceedings and movements of Moussa Bey. His action approved	46*
48	„ „ ..	216 A	26,	Alleged atrocities in Armenia. Conversation with Rustem Pasha	47
48*	Sir W. White ..	33 Confidential Telegraphic	28,	Mr. Fitzgerald, of "Standard," is going to Armenia. Danger of his getting into trouble	46*
49	„ „ ..	215	17,	Moussa Bey and Bitlis authorities. *Pro-memoria* from Porte attempting to disculpate	42
50	„ „ ..	216	17,	Armenian Petition from Van circulated for purpose of contradicting reports of disturbed condition of	48
51	„ „ ..	223 Secret	21,	Condition of Armenia. No truth in report that Russian Ambassador had called attention of Porte to	49
52	M. Hagopian ..	..	27,	Moussa Bey. Arrest of Armenian deputation to Grand Vizier, who came to complain of ..	50

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
53	Sir W. White ..	232	June 27, 1889	Moussa Bey. Arrival of at Constantinople on 24th. Information respecting his origin and antecedents	51
54	To M. Hagopian ..	..	July 1,	Arrest of Armenian deputation at Constantinople. Acknowledges receipt of No. 52 ..	52
54 A	To Sir W. White ..	220	1,	Arrest of Armenian deputation at Constantinople. Forwards copy of No. 52 ..	52A
54 B	Mr. C. D. Collet ..	..	July 4,	The Armenians and the Ottoman Government. Pope's invitation that Armenian Church should be placed under Church of Rome ..	52A
55	Sir W. White ..	237	June 28,	Discovery of revolutionary papers on dead body of Armenian brigand in Hekkiari	52
56	„ „ ..	241 Confidential	July 1,	Release of Armenian political prisoners at Van	53
57	„ „ ..	243	2,	Moussa Bey. Denial by of charges brought against him, which he is fully prepared to meet	54
58	„ „ ..	247	4,	Imprisonment of young Armenian for writing seditious poem. Erroneous impression conveyed by Lord Carnarvon's statement in House of Lords	56
59	„ „ ..	255	8,	Outrages in Kurdistan, and state of Hekkiari. Despatches from Colonel Chermside and Mr. Devey	57
60	„ „ ..	236	8,	Reported intention to settle large number of Circassians in Van. Despatch from Colonel Chermside	58
61	„ „ ..	38 Secret Telegraphic	14,	Moussa Bey. Alleged arrest of Armenian deputation absolutely denied. Trial will be public	59
62	„ „ ..	268 Secret	14,	Extends above	59
63	„ „ ..	262	11,	Revolutionary papers said to have been discovered on bodies of Armenians at Van. Telegram from Mr. Devey respecting ..	59
64	„ „ ..	276 Confidential	July 17,	Alleged arrest of Armenian deputation. No truth in. Memorial presented to Sultan by Armenians from Moush against Moussa Bey	60
65	„ „ ..	279 Most Conf.	19,	The Armenians and Moussa Bey. Memorandum by Mr. Marinitch of conversation with Armenian Patriarch	61
66	„ „ ..	285	22,	Raouf Pasha appointed Vali of Bitlis. Other administrative changes	63
67	Said Pasha to Rustem Pasha	..	25,	Armenian affairs. Information in support of statement that attacks are made by bands coming from Persia	63
68	Telegram from Van to the Grand Vizier	..	11 (23),	Armenian brigands killed near Van. Armenians of Van in no way connected with ..	64
69	Sir W. White ..	297 Confidential	29,	Armenian "Mazbata." Despatch from Mr. Devey respecting. Doubts as to authenticity of many of the signatures	65
70	„ „ ..	300	29,	Outrages by Kurds in district of Urumiah. Ill-treatment of American missionaries ..	65
71	„ „ ..	303 Confidential	30,	Revolutionary papers found on bodies of Armenians killed near Van. Report by Mr. Devey on	66
72	Archbishop of Canterbury	..	Aug. 12,	Mission to the Nestorians. Mr. Browne has found Vali of Van most kind as regards schools, &c.	72
73	To Archbishop of Canterbury	..	17,	Mission to the Nestorians. Acknowledges receipt of above. Copy will be sent to Sir W. White	73
74	To Sir W. White ..	271	19,	Mission to the Nestorians. Forwards copy of No. 72	73
75	Sir W. White ..	324	13,	Moussa Bey. Several persons proceeding to Constantinople to bring complaints against ..	73
76	„ „ ..	234	17,	New Vali of Beyrout. Arrival of Aziz Pasha. Despatch from Mr. Eldridge. His report of Raouf Pasha's administration unfavourable ..	74
77	„ „ ..	331	30,	Disorder in Diarbekir Vilayet. Complaints of connivance of Head of Police	75
78	„ „ ..	353 Confidential	30,	Moussa Bey. There appears every prospect that he will be subjected to regular trial ..	75

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
79	Sir W. White ..	370	Sept. 11, 1889	Moussa Bey. Despatch from Mr. Devey respecting witnesses who are to appear against	76
80	„ „ ..	375	14,	Colonel Chermside's journey to Van, Bitlis, and Moush. Forwards his Report on ..	77
80*	To Sir W. White ..	83 Telegraphic	25,	Mr. MacMillan's disappearance. Family propose writing to "Times" about	81*
81	Consul Chermside ..	..	12,	His recent tour in Kurdistan. Summary of. Country much less disturbed than formerly. Russian military activity normal ..	81
82	Sir W. White ..	Private	25,	Moussa Bey and state of Kurdistan, &c. Letter from Colonel Chermside, and Memorandum by Mr. Devey	83
83	„ „ ..	387	23,	Alleged outrages at Diarbekir and Mardin. Despatch from British Vice-Consul .	86
84	„ „ ..	402	30,	Reported arrest of Armenian deputation to Grand Vizier. Statement unfounded ..	87
85	„ „ ..	405	30,	Mr. Devey's recent tour in Bohtan and Hekkiari districts. Despatch from Colonel Chermside	88
86	To Sir A. Paget ..	173 Confidential	Oct. 17,	Agitation among Armenians within Russian frontier. Conversation with Austrian Chargé d'Affaires	89
87	Sir W. White ..	409	4,	Action of Kurdish tribes near Van. Steps taken to preserve order. Despatch from Mr. Devey	89
88	„ „ ..	414	8,	Menacing language of Christian clergy at Mardin. Information from Mr. Boyadjian ..	91
89	„ „ ..	415	11,	Moussa Bey. Judicial inquiry going on. Memorandum by Mr. Stavrides as to course of procedure	92
90	„ „ ..	416 Confidential	11,	Moussa Bey. Correspondence with United States' Chargé d'Affaires, who has been using his influence to bring Moussa to trial .	93
91	Mr. Löwy	..	24,	Grievances of Jews at Diarbekir. Asks for information as to their present treatment ..	94
92	Sir W. White ..	461	Nov. 21,	Moussa Bey. Preliminary inquiry into charges being continued. Forwards Memorandum respecting by Mr. Alvarez ..	95
93	„ „ ..	462 Confidential	21,	Moussa Bey trial. Memorandum presented to Grand Vizier calling attention to irregularities in connection with .	97
94	„ „ ..	463 Secret	22,	Moussa Bey. Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez of information respecting action and language of Bahry Pasha, Governor of Scutari ..	98
95	„ „ ..	464	22,	Moussa Bey. Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez of conversations with Schahbaz Effendi and Public Prosecutor. Trial begins to-morrow..	99
95 A	„ „ ..	74 Telegraphic	Dec. 2,	Moussa Bey has been acquitted	101*
95 B	To Sir W. White ..	396	6,	Moussa Bey trial. Approves of communication to Grand Vizier of Memorandum calling attention to irregularities	101*
96	Sir W. White ..	474	Nov. 27,	Moussa Bey trial. Memorandum of proceedings at first sitting of the Court ..	102
97	„ „ ..	475	27,	Moussa Bey. Transmits copy of indictment, of his Petition to Sultan, and other documents, extracted from official Turkish judicial journal	110
98	„ „ ..	477 Secret and Confidential	29,	Moussa trial. Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez of conversation with Minister of Police respecting imprisonment of Moussa and presence at trial of Palace official . ..	118
99	„ „ ..	478	Dec. 3,	Moussa trial. Copy of Judgment pronounced by Criminal Court of Appeal	120
100	„ „ ..	480	4,	Moussa trial. Continuation of report of proceedings	121
101	„ „ ..	485	6,	Moussa Bey. Opinion by Mr. Stavrides as to course pursued by the Bench and Public Prosecutor at the trial	129
102	„ „ ..	493 Secret and Confidential	7,	Moussa Bey. Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez on manner in which trial was conducted ..	130

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	Subject.	Page
103	Memorandum by Sir J. Fergusson ..	..	Dec. 17, 1889	Armenian question. Conversation on with M. Minasse Tchéraz	133
104	Sir W. White ..	482	5,	Moussa trial. Report of proceedings at third sitting of Court	134
105	,, ,, ..	483	6,	Moussa trial. Full report of fourth sitting and conclusion, by Mr. Alvarez	142
106	,, ,, ..	497	12,	Examination of Moussa Bey. Continuation of report from official judicial journal ..	153
107	,, ,, ..	500 Secret	17,	Moussa trial. Intrigues at Palace directed against his Excellency and against Grand Vizier in connection with	170
108	,, ,, ..	501	17,	Moussa trial. Irregularities in course of. Remarks respecting	171
109	,, ,, ..	509	20,	Moussa trial. Remarks in Turkish press on interest shown in by Her Majesty's Embassy. Attempts to prejudice latter in eyes of Turkish people	172
110	,, ,, ..	510 Confidential	20,	Moussa Bey. Reply of Porte to representations of United States' Legation respecting outrage on two American missionaries	173
111	,, ,, ..	515	23,	Moussa trial. Article from "Tarik" on. Allusions to presence of Embassy officials at..	174

ERRATUM.

Page 17, Inclosure 3 in No. 23, line 2. For "Americans, read "Armenians."

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. January 1890.

CONFIDENTIAL.

Further Correspondence respecting Administrative Reforms in the Asiatic Provinces of Turkey.

[In continuation of Confidential Paper No. 5764.]

No. 1.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received January* 3, 1889.)

(No. 517.)

My Lord, *Constantinople, December* 29, 1888.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 504 of the 19th instant, with regard to the sentence of exile passed on an Armenian school teacher at Erzeroum, I have the honour to transmit herewith copy of a further despatch on the subject which I have received from Her Majesty's Consul at Erzeroum.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 1.

Colonel Chermside to Sir W. White.

Sir, *Erzeroum, December* 12, 1888.

I HAVE the honour to inform your Excellency, with reference to my despatch of the 6th December, that the sentence on the individual therein mentioned is "exile for life," and not "imprisonment for life." This sentence has been in the usual course referred to the Final Tribunal ("Temyiz") at Constantinople for ratification or the reverse.

I have the honour to forward, at his request, a statement by the Rev. D. Richardson concerning the case, which may interest your Excellency. This gentleman informed me that a lawyer is to be engaged at Constantinople to observe the proceeding as to decision of sentence on the defendant's behalf; the intermediaries in this affair will be American missionaries in Constantinople, and it seems quite possible that they may request the American Minister to exert influence in the case.

I have, &c.
(Signed) HERBERT CHERMSIDE.

Inclosure 2 in No. 1.

Statement by the Rev. D. Richardson.

THE defendant in this case, Apramham Seklemian, is charged with violation of section 66, Criminal Code, and is sentenced to life exile.

He protests against this decision, and appeals to the Supreme Court, Constantinople.

The facts charged are as follows:—

The defendant was teacher in the Erzeroum Protestant High School. He was handed an essay for correction, which proved to be a seditious poem. He admits having made two grammatical corrections in the first part before reading the poem. It is charged that he made a third in the latter part, but he does not admit this. There is no evidence to show that he made any of the corrections, except his own confession. It is not charged that he did anything in the matter except to make these three corrections.

He appeals on the following grounds :—

1. He admits negligence in not personally destroying the document, but considered his order to the pupil to do so sufficient.

2. He is not guilty of section 66, Criminal Code. This law punishes with life exile those "who make a seditious harangue, post up in a public place such a document, or publish such an article." It is not charged by the prosecution that he has done any of these things, or that he has been accessory to any of them. Further, he is not charged with violation of any other law, yet he is found guilty and sentenced to the full penalty of section 66, Criminal Code—life exile.

3. Neither can his action in this case be said to have violated any law in any particular. While it is admitted by the defence that the poem was seditious, it is admitted by the prosecution that the defendant did not write it. Neither was he accessory to its writing. He merely marked two grammatical errors in the early part of the poem, then, noticing its seditious character, handed it back to the pupil, reprimanding him severely, and ordering him to destroy it immediately. This the pupil neglected to do. The prosecution brings no evidence to show these statements false, the Court merely disregarding them in its decision.

4. The defendant protests against being condemned without being allowed to produce witnesses in his own defence, or having credence given to his statements explaining his confession, which is the only valid evidence of the prosecution. The defendant further alleges that he is a loyal subject of the Sublime Porte, having never had sympathy or connection with sedition in any form.

Copy of statement by Rev. D. Richardson, given to me 9th December, 1888.

No. 2.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received January* 10.)

(No. 2.)

Constantinople, January 2, 1889.

My Lord,

IN forwarding to your Lordship the accompanying copy of a preliminary Report drawn up by Colonel Chermside, C.B., C.M.G., on the recent troubles at Hakkiari, I trust your Lordship will see how difficult it is to obtain anything approaching to accuracy from such a distant and inaccessible district.

In addition to tribal permanent jealousy and hostility always existing between the Mussulman Kurds and the Christian Nestorians, there was, it appears, in the recent scare the natural fear on the part of the latter that the Turkish force which was being concentrated was so for the purpose of disarming them, and of forcing taxation in those localities which have hitherto refused to be subjected to anything of the kind.

It is impossible to say with any degree of certainty whether, and to what extent, a religious animosity entered into these dangerous feuds which are always recurring from time to time, and on which a very sharp look-out must very naturally be kept.

A few days ago Colonel Bell, R.E., spent a day here on his way home, and, although he had not visited the actual spot during his progress, he gathered some rumours which are not without interest as to the condition of that locality in which his Grace the Primate takes such a warm interest, and your Lordship may deem it worth while to ask Colonel Bell (Intelligence Department) for a Memorandum with reference to the Nestorians, who, it is to be hoped, will be left in peace in future.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 2.

Consul Chermside to Sir W. White.

Sir,

Erzeroum, December 20, 1888.

WITH regard to your Excellency's telegram of the 17th December concerning recent troubles in Hakkiari, and previous despatches on the subject, I have the honour to inform your Excellency that I have received no official reports on the subject either from the late or the present Vice-Consul at Van. On the 12th October I passed your Excellency's despatch of the 27th September to the latter, with its inclosures, a Memorandum from Lieutenant-Colonel Trotter, and a letter from the Rev. Mr. Browne. I mentioned in a private letter to your Excellency the great difficulty at present existing in obtaining intelligence at Van, owing to the suspicion with which the Vice-Consulate is regarded by the authorities. Mr. Devey, I may mention, appears to have entered into very good relations with the Vali.

Mr. Devey, however, as I informed your Excellency, told me I must give him time. On receipt of your Excellency's telegram I called on Mr. Devey to forward the Report as soon as possible.

The following are the facts as far as I have been able to gather and connect them.

I may mention to your Excellency that in 1881-82 I travelled all through the districts in question.

The tribal Nestorians are established, as your Excellency is aware, in the most rugged, difficult, and "accidenté" portion of the Zab Valley and its tributaries, their districts are more or less bounded on all sides by high mountain uplands of far easier contour, with many rolling tracts of pasture land, the rights of grazing in which belong to various Kurdish tribes who leave them in winter.

These tribes in their emigrations skirt or pass through parts of the tribal Nestorians' country, besides which, as the Nestorians have flocks, there are often questions concerning the rights to pastures.

The most important tribe are the Hartush Kurds; their name is written in Kiepert's Map across their summer pastures, north-east of the Nestorian country, but in winter they are mostly to be found south of Amadieh, and between that and Mosul they have some villages near Akra.

To the north and north-east of Amadieh is the wide Berwari Valley, the Christians of which, though of the same race as the Nestorians, are mostly Catholics, and called Chaldeans. There are a few non-tribal Nestorian hamlets. To the north and north-west of this lies the most important Nestorian tribal district, Tiyari, containing the villages of Asheetta and Lizan, besides many hamlets. The Kurds of Berwari are traditionally hostile to the Tiyaris, but Berwari, f my memory is correct, is not the habitat of any one important Kurdish tribe.

To the east of Tiyari and of the Zab, beyond the great Salaberka Valley, lies the Nestorian tribal district of Thkoma, and on the south of this come the Pinyanish tribal Kurds, who remain permanently more or less in the same district. There are traditional feuds between the Thkoma (or Thkoba) and Tiyari tribal Nestorians. The Pinyanish Kurds are usually on good terms with the former, and hostile to the latter.

The Hartush Kurds are usually on fair terms with the Tiyari, partly, doubtless, from expediency, as the latter hold a very strong position on the Hartush communications.

Occasionally the Kurds combine against the Christians, as some fifty years ago, at the time of the massacres by Beder Khan, described in Sir H. Layard's books. The tribal Nestorians up till now, or till quite recently, only paid contributions, not regular taxes, and their two great causes of fear from the Government have been the enforcing of regular taxes, and being deprived of their arms.

An armed Christian population is naturally looked on by the Turkish Government with suspicion. It is, moreover, in an important strategical position as regards Mesopotamia, and has been several times visited of late years by Russian officials and travellers (*e.g.*, 1881—M. Yussefovitch, a high official of Tiflis Government, who held large meetings of the Nestorian Chiefs in a monastery in the Walto district, November 1881).

During the operations against the Kurds in Nerwi, Baradost, Gerdi, and Shemdinan in 1879-81 the Nestorians were most excited as to the possibility of action by the Government against themselves, and were talking of armed resistance. In the

present year, from some cause which I have not ascertained, the Hartush Kurds were hostile to the Tiyari Nestorians.

Further, last winter a Sheikh Mehmed Nourri, or Nourallah, who, I believe, resides in the Pinyanish district, proposed an expedition of any Kurdish tribes he could rally in the spring against Tiyari; the Southern Hartush were doubtless asked to join, and even if the latter were a separate subsequent movement, this general ebullition of hostile feeling was probably the cause of the Kurdish troubles in Berwari, where the Kurds are in a minority.

The Thkoma tribal Nestorians were invited, I believe, by the above-named Sheikh to join in the attack on their traditional fellow-Christian enemies, the Tiyari. This they do not appear to have done. The Kurds this spring and summer mustered on the south of Tiyari, and their numbers (probably exaggerated) are said to have reached 8,000. A village or villages were, I believe, undoubtedly attacked, some women ravished,* and seven lives lost.

While the Kurds were mustering, news reached the Nestorians that the Government was sending troops from Van and Mosul, and their old fears as to being disarmed, and probably as to taxation, revived.

It was at this time that Mr. Browne appears to have written the somewhat confused statement which your Excellency forwarded to me (it is at Van, and I have not a copy yet). The Kurds further looted 4,000 sheep. As yet I have heard of no excesses on the part of the Government troops, and only the necessary repressive action against the Kurds. The column from Van consisted of two battalions under the command of Mehemed Bey, a Staff officer from Erzeroum. The Vali of Van also proceeded to Hakkiari.

The sheep, with the exception of 600 to 700, were recovered and restored to their owners. It is also, I believe, proposed to exile the Sheikh who incited the Kurdish movement. On one occasion, I believe, in Nerwi or near Rizan, in Sherwan, resistance was shown to the troops by the Kurds. With their muzzle-loading rifles they were not able to keep the ground for a few minutes against the Martini rifles of the regulars, and were speedily dispersed, with a loss of fifteen killed and wounded. Part or all troops have returned to Van, the officer commanding to Erzeroum. All reports agree that tranquillity was very easily restored, and Mr. Devey informed me in a private letter that he had forwarded in November to your Excellency a letter from Mr. Browne, from Kochanes, reporting the satisfactory line followed by the Vali towards the Nestorians and Kurds, and thanking your Excellency for your action in the matter and your Excellency's representations to the Porte.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HERBERT CHERMSIDE, *Colonel.*

No. 3.

Evangelical Alliance to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received January* 16.)

(Extract.) 7, *Adam Street, Strand, January* 10, 1889.

REFERRING to your Lordship's letter of the 21st November last, in regard to the case of Nicolaki Effendi in Turkey, I am directed by the Council to send your Lordship the inclosed extract from a letter recently received from our Committee in Constantinople.

Inclosure in No. 3.

Extract from Letter of Secretary, Evangelical Alliance, at Constantinople, December 6, 1888.

NICOLAKI EFFENDI is still detained at Trebizond. The Governor-General, in conversation with the local representative of the Protestants in that city, said that there are no charges against Nicolaki Effendi sustained by any evidence, but that it is thought best to detain him. On being pressed with the injustice of allowing a man's business to be ruined by such prolonged detention without cause, he replied that Nicolaki Effendi had been sent to Trebizond by orders from the Sublime Porte, and that he could not take the responsibility of permitting him to return to his home.

---

* Admitted by Turks.

No. 4.

Memorandum by Colonel Bell on Recent Events, &c., in Hakkiari.—(*Received January* 16, 1889.)

BEFORE leaving Tehran in November last I had heard rumours of excesses of Kurds in the Lower Tiari valleys. About the middle of December, near Erzeroum, I met an Armenian Inspector of Roads who had just returned from Tall and Julamerik, where he had been with the Vali. He told me that there had been no rising of the Kurds in that vicinity. His narrative was somewhat as below: that zaptiehs having been dispatched to the Tál Valley from Julamerik or Bash-Kala (head-quarters) to collect revenue, had, according to their custom, quartered themselves on the Nestorians of that valley; that the Tálnai declined to meet their forced requisitions, but offered provisions on payment. Certain exactions roused their anger to such a pitch that they attacked the zaptiehs, who thereupon opened fire and killed some thirty of the villagers. But the excitement spreading through Tiari and the southern Nestorian valleys, reinforcements of troops (one battalion) were moved to Julamerik and Tál, where the Vali repaired in person and called upon Mar Simon to exercise his authority with the tribes to induce them to pay revenue; not only was the yearly revenue demanded, but in addition arrears for the past thirty or forty years during which it has remained unpaid. Mar Simon promised to collect the year's revenue if time were allowed; the troops were withdrawn before its collection, and none has since been paid.

Although my informant denied the gathering of the Kurds, after reading the papers sent to me it seems most probable that to check reprisals on the part of the Tiari, &c., some such gathering did take place, and that the Turkish authorities took little or no notice of it, perhaps even connived at it. The hill Nestorians are the most unruly and ignorant of the subjects of the Porte in Kurdistan, pay no revenue, give no aid to the State, and can scarcely in consequence expect the authorities to go to much expense to protect them.

A most anomalous state of affairs exists in the valleys of Tiari, Tchob, Salabacca, &c. (fully appreciated by Colonel Trotter, *vide* his Memorandum). I cannot better perhaps illustrate the nature of these "Asharette" tribes, *i.e.*, tribes not under control, than by asking a perusal of pp. 65, 66, 67, and 68, where marked, of the rough copy of the Report giving my own personal experiences in these valleys. My sympathy is rather with the Governors than the governed, for in this "kingdom within a kingdom" a condition of things exists scarcely to be tolerated in any even semi-civilized country, resulting in all power being in the hands of the lawless minority.

A perusal of pp. 47 to 69, where marked, will give other details of interest perhaps, full details are to be found in vol. ii.

The location of the Nestorians, &c., is given at p. 55, where marked.

It was in 1886 that I visited the Nestorian hills, and yet I cannot agree either with the estimate of the policy of the Porte made by Mr. A. Riley, or with his remarks on the tyranny of the Turks, for no Turkish official had been able to exact revenue from most of the valleys up to that date, *i.e.*, for some thirty to forty years back, and I heard of no "boycotting" of supplies by the Turks. The Talnai provided me with mules, and accompanied me to Mosul. In Tál there were complaints that the Pinianish Kurds still exercised their ancient pasture rights over that valley and exacted a corresponding money tribute. I found Kurdish villages scattered amongst those of Nestorians and all living on friendly terms.

Although asked for no opinion, I beg to be excused for expressing several, viz.:—

That if British protection extends over the hill Nestorians, means require to be taken to insure that the Turkish Exchequer does not suffer; at present it does suffer.

That it is necessary to teach them that amount of subjection necessary to all good subjects (a more impracticable lot of unreasonable beings—the powerful minority*—it would be difficult to find anywhere).

That measures are necessary to be taken to afford the surplus hill Nestorian population a means of extending their holdings southwards (this is possible). They must starve without some outlet near at home, notwithstanding that very many of them seek employment during the winter in such centres as Diarbekir, &c.

* Amongst the tribes are to be found high-minded men of ability, such as Khoja Solomon, a Catholic Nestorian or Chaldean of Gundukhta, &c., anxious to pay a fair tribute and to live on good terms with their rulers.

N.B.—I was told, both in 1886 and again recently in 1888, by Turks and Armenians, that the Nestorians were nominally Turkish but really British subjects.

I have no doubt that our Government, notwithstanding the difficulty of settling disputes amongst semi-nomads, can arrange without difficulty that appropriate limits and grazing grounds shall be assigned to both Nestorians and their Kurdish neighbours without prejudice to existing tenure and ancient grazing rights, and that an equitable taxation be settled and arrears cancelled. Good soil in plenty exists towards Amadiah, Mosul, Shaikh Adi, &c., and Kurds and Nestorians can live together on good terms under Turkish rule, guided by the Representatives of the British Government in Turkey.

(Signed) MARK S. BELL, *Colonel.*

January 14, 1889.

No. 5.

Mersina, Tarsus, and Adana Railway Company to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received January 19.)

My Lord, 8, *Great Winchester Street, London, January* 17, 1889.

HAVING previously brought this Company to your Lordship's notice, and having received from your Lordship support in its defence against the oppressive action of the Administration of the Ottoman Public Debt, we now feel it our duty to submit to your Lordship its present position.

1. We inclose a sketch Map showing the railway constructed and its natural extensions.

2. The railway as constructed is very favourably situated as the starting point for a railway to the Euphrates and Tigris Rivers.

3. A Concession can, we have reason to believe, be easily obtained by the present Company for the eastern extension to Diarbekr or Bagdad.

4. We have had the best route, as we believe, for such extension examined as far as Berejik, and it is very little to the north of the one believed to have been approved by Sir Charles Wilson, K.C.M.G.

5. To the south of the railway of this Company is one of the best ports of Asia Minor, viz., the Bay of Yourmourtalik or Ayas. The merits of this port are well known to British naval officers, and copy of rough soundings taken for this Company are inclosed. The Concession for this port, and a short connecting line to Adana or Missis, can, we have also reason to believe, be easily obtained by this Company.

6. Your Lordship's attention is requested towards the position of this railway and the Port of Yourmourtalik or Ayas with regard to Cyprus.

7. This Company has, by reason of the oppressive action of the Turkish Government and of the Administration of the Ottoman Public Debt, and on account of the cost of remedying the defective construction by its contractors, reached a financial position in which the control of the railway will probably fall, within a very brief period, into French hands.

8. On stating the above facts to your Lordship, we desire to inform your Lordship—

(*a.*) That we believe the control of the railway can at present be preserved in England by a very small cash expenditure, say, 15,000*l.*, which will also insure the acquisition of a majority of the shares. In addition, some diplomatic influence will be needed to sustain the Company against undue pressure and possibly to hasten the obtainment of the Concessions mentioned.

(*b.*) That when the Concessions for such extensions have been obtained, it will be time enough for the British Government to decide how far, if at all, it will aid in their execution. Meanwhile, the position will be held by British interests, and, so far as is required, under Government control.

If your Lordship deems the matter of sufficient importance, we shall, if your Lordship so desires, be prepared to give more detailed information at an interview or in a Memorandum.

I have, &c.

(Signed) JOHN COLLINSON, *Chairman.*

No. 6.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.

(No. 24.)

Sir, *Foreign Office, January* 21, 1889.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 350 of the 20th November, respecting the imprisonment of an Armenian merchant named Nicolaki Effendi, at Trebizond, I transmit to your Excellency herewith a copy of a further communication from the Evangelical Alliance stating that Nicolaki Effendi is still detained at Trebizond, notwithstanding that the Vali is reported to have admitted that there are no charges, sustained by any evidence, against him.

I am, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.

P.S.—Since the above was written I have received a further letter from the Evangelical Alliance, of which a copy is also inclosed, to the effect that Nicolaki has been set at liberty, though he is not yet allowed to return to his home.

S.

No. 7.

Foreign Office to Evangelical Alliance.

Sir, *Foreign Office, January* 21, 1889.

I AM directed by the Marquis of Salisbury to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, reporting the continued detention of the Armenian merchant, Nicolaki Effendi, at Trebizond, although the Vali is reported to have admitted that there are no charges, sustained by any evidence, against him; and I am to inform you that a copy of your communication will be forwarded to Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, with reference to the instructions which have already been sent to his Excellency on the subject.

I am, &c.

(Signed) JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

No. 8.

Evangelical Alliance to Foreign Office.—(Received January 22.)

Sir, 7, *Adam Street, Strand, January* 22, 1889.

I AM much obliged by your letter of yesterday's date, written on behalf of the Marquis of Salisbury, with reference to the case of Nicolaki Effendi.

As we have just received a further letter from our correspondent in Constantinople, which shows that Nicolaki is now released, though not allowed to return to his home, I send you an extract from the letter; for the Council of the Evangelical Alliance are anxious that this should go to Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople with the previous extract which I had forwarded to the Marquis of Salisbury.

I remain, &c.

(Signed) A. J. ARNOLD, *Secretary.*

Inclosure in No. 8.

The Rev. Dr. Dwight to Evangelical Alliance.

(Extract.) *Constantinople, December* 21, 1888.

NICOLAKI EFFENDI, of Alacham, has been released at last from Trebizond and has returned to Samsoun. Whether this results from the interest in the case shown by Sir W. White I cannot say, but I am inclined to think that it is the result of his unofficial inquiry. However, Nicolaki Effendi is not yet out of difficulty, for the Governor of Samsoun has declined to allow him to return to Alacham for the present. We hope that further efforts which we are making here will result in his entire freedom.

No. 9.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.

(No. 26.)

Foreign Office, January 22, 1889.

Sir,

WITH reference to my despatch No. 204 of the 27th June last, I transmit to your Excellency herewith a copy of a further letter from the Mersina, Tarsus, and Adana Railway Company relative to the present position of that undertaking.*

The object of this communication appears to be to induce Her Majesty's Government to purchase the line, or the principal interest in it, for a sum of 15,000*l.*, and thus to prevent the control of the railway from falling into foreign hands.

It is obvious that such an offer could not be accepted by Her Majesty's Government, but I should be glad to be favoured with any observations which your Excellency may have to offer with regard to the present position of the undertaking, and the proposals for its extension which are mentioned in the letter.

I am, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 10.

Foreign Office to the Mersina, Tarsus, and Adana Railway Company.

Foreign Office, January 22, 1889.

Sir,

I AM directed by the Marquis of Salisbury to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th instant, and its inclosures, relative to the present position of the Mersina, Tarsus, and Adana Railway Company, and the proposals for its extension.

I am, &c.

(Signed) JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

No. 11.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received January* 24.)

(No. 10. Confidential.)

Constantinople, January 15, 1889.

My Lord,

ON New Year's Day it is customary for the different Ambassadors to send their good wishes, through Dragomans, to the chiefs of the different Christian communities at Constantinople.

Mr. Marinitsch, who was sent with a similar message of courtesy to the Armenian Patriarch on the (1st) 13th instant, has reported to me a conversation he had with His Holiness.

The Patriarch wished to inform me that his clergy were steady in their allegiance to the Imperial Ottoman Government, but that he should be glad if the Sublime Porte were to issue instructions to the local authorities in the provinces and districts conterminous to the Russian Empire to carry out a conciliatory policy towards the Armenians. He added that from what he learnt of the clergy of his nation under Russian rule these do not appear at all desirous that their brethren in Turkey should change allegiance from that of the Sultan to that of the Czar.

His Holiness also spoke of the interest he took in some of the political offenders of his nation who had been sent into exile, and that he had submitted a list of all of them with a recommendation of mercy to the Sultan. He evidently was desirous to enlist my sympathy and support at the Palace on these points.

I believe I shall be acting in the sense of your Lordship's wishes if, without making any representations, not even unofficially, I shall do what I properly can, privately, to assist the Armenians and their Patriarch, should a favourable opportunity present itself, though of course these are matters of extreme delicacy.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

---

* No. 5.

No. 12.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received January* 24.)

(No. 14.)

Constantinople, January 17, 1889.

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship copy of a despatch which I have received from Her Majesty's Consul at Damascus, reporting the result of an expedition undertaken by the local authorities against certain tribes of Bedouin Arabs in the neighbourhood of that town.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 12.

Consul Dickson to Sir W. White.

Damascus, January 3, 1889.

Sir

I HAVE the honour to report to your Excellency that for some time past certain Bedouin tribes, namely, the Ghyats, the Amur, the Hassan, the Sharafat, and others, who during the greater part of the year are encamped a short distance to the east of Damascus, have been making depredations on the Imperial domains near Aleppo, and have been molesting and plundering the caravans on their way to and from Bagdad. The authorities therefore decided that it was time that proper punishment should be inflicted on these tribes, who had ventured quite recently to pillage the village of Adra, close to Damascus, and against whom there were numerous complaints on the part of the native merchants and traders. His Excellency the Governor-General accordingly organized, about two months ago, an expedition against them, which consisted of about 300 mounted police, under the command of Fevzi Pasha, the Colonel of the gendarmerie. This expedition at first proceeded to Jebel-el-Abiad, on the road to Palmyra, where Fevzi Pasha attacked the Amur Arabs, killing about eighteen of them and capturing their flocks. He then returned to Jerûd and Dumier, and, having received intelligence that the Ghyat Arabs had plundered a small village called Rehibeh, and had carried away the sheep and goats, he started from Dumier, accompanied by Sheikh Ibn Mezied, of the tribe El Hesseneh, who have always been loyal to the Sultan, and attacked the Ghyat and Sharafat Arabs, who had taken refuge in the mountains of the Safa (Eastern Trachon), where he is reported to have completely routed them, capturing 416 camels, about 3,000 sheep and goats, and 32 tents. He returned to Damascus on the 16th ultimo, bringing with him twenty-two prisoners, among whom was Sheikh Khalaf-el-Mutlak and his brother, of the tribe El Hassan. The booty taken has been sold by public auction by order of the Governor-General, and a sum of between £T. 2,000 and £T. 3,000 has been realized.

A difference of opinion, I am informed, concerning this affair exists between the civil and military authorities. The action of the former is blamed by the latter, who state that undue severity has been exercised towards some of the tribes, such as the Hassan, who have hitherto shown submission to the Government, but from whom the greater number of the prisoners have been taken, whereas they allege the Ghyat and the Sharafat Arabs, who openly defy the authorities, have succeeded in escaping punishment, as the police were unable to follow them into the fastnesses of the Safa, where they at present remain in security.

I have, &c.

(Signed) JOHN DICKSON.

No. 13.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received January* 24.)

(No. 27.)

Constantinople, January 20, 1889.

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship, with reference to your Lordship's No. 375 of the 10th December last and my No. 2 of the 2nd instant,

copy of a despatch, and its inclosure, which I have received from Her Majesty's Consul for Kurdistan on the subject of the disturbances in the Zab Valley.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 13.

Consul Chermside to Sir W. White.

Erzeroum, January 9, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Excellency the Report from Her Majesty's Vice-Consul at Van called for in your Excellency's despatch of the 9th October and telegram of the 17th December. The chief points in Mr. Devey's Report not mentioned in my *ad interim* Report of the 20th December are (1) that the Goyyan Kurds were concerned in the disturbances; this is a nomad tribe of many clans who frequent the Eastern Bohtan district and the mountainous valleys of the Upper Khabur River and parts of the Berwari district; (2) that the Sheikh Nourullah has been exiled; (3) that the local officials of the Mosoul Government are to blame in not discouraging the anti-Christian agitation among the Kurds in its earlier phases.

The Van authorities appear to have acted judiciously, and tranquillity to have been easily restored.

The disturbances emphasize the expediency of the Turkish Government enforcing its control over the nomad and other Kurds in the Bohtan and Hekkiari, as well as in other districts, and the application of some military service would probably be the most advantageous thing.

Great financial difficulties stand in the way of a strong Civil Government, as the district is a very unremunerative one, and would be, as it I believe is under present arrangements, administered at a loss. The stationing of numerous small detachments of troops, almost all of Turkish origin, among the Kurdish districts is not only expensive but acts very prejudically on the efficiency of the important 4th Army Corps, the Russian frontier corps. It would be preferable for any detachments required near Amadiah to be furnished from the 6th Army Corps.

The establishment of local military Kurdish centres would have many advantages, but it is very doubtful if the desertion which would ensue from Kurds serving in or near their own districts would not render such an idea unfeasible. It would also be of great importance to develop by the labour of the inhabitants some military lines of communication in this very important strategical district.

I have, &c.
(Signed) HERBERT CHERMSIDE, *Colonel.*

Inclosure 2 in No. 13.

Vice-Consul Devey to Consul Chermside.

Van, December 24, 1888.

Sir,

WITH reference to your despatch of the 13th October last, I have the honour to return herewith the three inclosures therein contained, and to report that at present perfect tranquillity reigns in Hekkiari, and that the relations between Kurds and Nestorians are much more satisfactory than they were at the beginning of the year. It would seem that about that time a Roman Catholic missionary on the way to Mosoul with a certain Hojja Shliemon of Gundiktha, a village of Kurds friendly to the Tiyari, had been plundered by the Nestorian tribe Tkhouba, and that the usual retaliation followed, in which some lives were lost. Besides this affray, the Kurds about Julamerik had given offence in various ways, in particular by the desecration of a church, and the Tiyari had sworn vengeance, and had already possessed themselves of a number of Kurdish sheep. The Hekkiari Government, anticipating trouble, ordered restitution of the stolen sheep, but this the Nestorians under Melek Ismaïl refused on the grounds that the Kurds were retaining more of their sheep than they had of the Kurds, and they were further discontented at the partiality shown by the Julamerik authorities in administering justice, as whilst they were punished for crimes of stealing, wounding, &c., the Kurds went scot free for the same offences.

Whilst the position of the Tiyari therefore, on the one hand beset by the Kurds, and on the other unfairly treated by the local authorities, was far from agreeable, a certain Sheikh Mehmed Nouri or Nourullah (since exiled) began to preach to the Kurds in the region of Amadiah a general massacre of the Christians, and his exhortations finally bore fruit in a proposal by the Kurds (Mehmed Agha of the Goyyan tribe taking the lead) to the Tkhouba to join them in annihilating the Tiyari. By August the number of Kurds under arms exceeded 6,000 if it did not reach 8,000, and they were making forays, and had on one occasion at least ravished several women; altogether seven lives only were lost, and 4,000 sheep lifted. All the sheep have since been restored with the exception of 400, for which indemnification is to be made at the rate of 40 piastres per head. There can be no doubt that the Mosoul Government were well aware of Nourullah's preaching, but instead of promptly suppressing it, rather led the Kurds to believe, though without committing themselves to any overt act or declaration, that they were at liberty to attack the Nestorians. The Vali of Mosoul has recently been removed.

In the meantime, the Vali of Van received instructions to re-establish order in Hekkiari, and two battalions, the 3rd of the 29th Regiment and the 2nd of the 32nd Regiment, were proceeding there from this town for the purpose. These troops advanced to Beit-es-Shebab, where they first came into collision with the Kurds, whom they gradually drove back to Chal. The fighting was of a most trifling character; on one occasion the soldiers were stoned as they were passing a mountain in Tkhouba, and the Kurds also fired upon them, but with their inferior ranged weapon could not oppose any effective resistance to the advance, even assuming they were in earnest; two soldiers were wounded, and possibly some few Kurds fell. The two battalions returned here a fortnight ago. The Vali reached Julamerik in the last week of August, and spent about five weeks there, chiefly occupied in causing restitution of the stolen sheep, while the Nestorians returned to their homes, and the Kurds were dispersed almost without opposition. Order being by this time restored, his Excellency proceeded down the Tkhouba Valley to Chal, a Mussulman village of eighty houses and the seat of a Kaïmakam, where he remained a fortnight, and thence returned here early in November. He appears to have executed justice impartially, and to have laboured to set the Government on a firmer basis, and whilst at Julamerik the Mutessarif of Hekkiari went on with Marshimoum to superintend the restitution of the sheep to the Nestorians of Ashitha. His Excellency was much pleased with the courage and frank straightforwardness of the tribal Nestorians, and amused at their notions, bred of peasant ignorance, of their own importance, but considers that their country would best be governed by military officers. In truth, the Nestorian community is not over well affected towards the Government, for while the poverty-stricken "Rayah" Nestorian suffers from Kurdish oppression and a heavy burden of taxes, his mountain brethren are constantly under the suspicion that the Porte is about to make an attempt upon their quasi-independence; hence the reports that the battalions sent this summer would begin by disarming them, which it will be quite early enough to set about when the Kurds are taught submission and loyalty; for at present Hekkiari contributes no single recruit to the active army. It would be, perhaps, a little rash to introduce a military administration "de but en blanc," but in no case should a district populated by 65,000 Nestorians, of whom more than half practically do not recognize the Porte at all, as many Kurds, and with an influx in summer of some 50,000 nomads, should such a district be without a permanent military force even in winter to maintain order, and it might be advisable to add to the present force of two battalions, numbering some 500 rank and file, scattering small detachments over the country in view of the difficulty of communication and of obtaining sufficient provisions. The reduction of the vilayet to its former grade of sandjak, brought about last May, cannot be of the slightest harm to the Porte or loss to the inhabitants, while the economy is considerable.

I have the honour to inclose a list of troops as at present disposed in Hekkiari, and to remain, &c.

(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

Inclosure 3 in No. 13.

List of Troops in Hekkiari Sandjak, December 1888.

29th Regiment—		
1st Battalion	1	"buluk" at Julamerik.
	3	" at Bashkaleh.
	1	" at Bajberka.
4th Battalion (in Gevver)	1	" at Shemdina.
	2	" at Gevver.

The "buluk" should consist of eighty rank and file.

No. 14.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.

(No. 34.)
Foreign Office, January 26, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE received your despatch No. 10, Confidential, of the 15th instant, reporting a conversation between Mr. Marinitch and the Armenian Patriarch, in which allusion was made by his Holiness to the exiled political offenders of his nation. The course which your Excellency proposes to pursue in this matter has the approval of Her Majesty's Government.

I am, &c.
(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 15.

Evangelical Alliance to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received February* 2.)

7, Adam Street, Strand, London, February 1, 1889.

My Lord,

REFERRING to my letter of the 10th January, I have now the pleasure, on behalf of our Council, to inform your Lordship that we have this day received from our correspondent in Constantinople a communication, dated the 28th January, in which he reports that Nicolaki Effendi has been released and permitted to return to his home at Alacham.

It appears that the Governor of Trebizond, learning that the British Consul had received orders to make a report on the case, sent a despatch to the Governor of Samsoun, where Nicolaki then was, allowing him to return to his home.

This gratifying result is due to the attention devoted to this case of religious liberty by your Lordship, and to the instructions forwarded to Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople. Our Council gratefully acknowledge your Lordship's valuable services, together with those of Sir William White.

Believe me, &c.
(Signed) A. J. ARNOLD, *Secretary.*

No. 16.

Foreign Office to Evangelical Alliance.

Foreign Office, February 6, 1889.

Sir,

I AM directed by the Marquis of Salisbury to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st instant, informing him of the release of Nicolaki Effendi, the Armenian merchant, lately imprisoned at Trebizond, who has now been allowed to return to his home, and I am to express his Lordship's satisfaction at the result which has been attained in this case.

I am, &c.
(Signed) JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

No. 17.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received February* 21.)

(No. 56.)
Constantinople, February 7, 1889.

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship copy of a despatch I have received from Her Majesty's Vice-Consul at Van, reporting on the alleged desecration of churches in Mahmoudi.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 17.

Vice-Consul Devey to Consul Chermside.

Van, January 9, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to inform you that a telegram was recently sent from here to Constantinople in three copies, addressed respectively to the Grand Vizier, the Minister of Justice, and the Armenian Patriarch, complaining of the desecration of the churches of the villages Hasbestan, Setmanis, and Akhorig (inhabitants Kurds and Armenians mixed), in the vicinity of Serail and Bashkalah.

The alleged desecration is stated to have taken place seven or eight months ago, and to have been instigated by the Kurdish Aghas of the villages, and especially by Hussein Agha of Akhorig.

Information was sent to the Armenian Bishop here, and he made a communication to the Vali, who promised redress; at the same time, a complaint was lodged with the Hekkiari authorities. A Mustantik was shortly afterwards sent from Bashkaleh, but being unable to obtain evidence, gave sentence that there was no case. The Vali thereupon gave orders to a Sous-Procureur-Général, newly appointed to Hekkiari, and at that time passing through Van, to make further inquiries, and he also reported the complaint as being purely vexatious. Finally, his Excellency being in that district last August, made a personal investigation, and also privately questioned a resident, Nestorian Melik (Chief), as able to bear impartial witness, and was satisfied either that no desecration had taken place at all, or, that if some foolish and objectionable practical joke had been thoughtlessly played near the church doors, Hussein Agha was in no way concerned. Hussein Agha was in general well disposed towards the Christians, and, with the high respect in which Moslems exceed perhaps Christians for places of sanctity, had been known to make offerings in money to Christian churches and monasteries. His Excellency was inclined to ascribe the renewal of the complaint after so long an interval to the intrigues of certain malevolent persons.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

No. 18.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received February* 21.)

(No. 64.)
Constantinople, February 12, 1889.

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship, with reference to my despatch No. 27 of the 20th ultimo, copy of a further Report of Mr. Vice-Consul Devey on the subject of the Zab Valley disturbances, which has been forwarded to me by Her Majesty's Consul at Erzeroum.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 18.

Vice-Consul Devey to Consul Chermside.

Van, January 9, 1889.

Sir,

WITH reference to my despatch of the 24th December last, I have the honour to state that I find it difficult to obtain further information, but have no reason to believe that the southern parts of Hekkiari Sanjak are in other than a perfectly tranquil condition. A telegram was lately received here, stating that the Nestorians were pasturing their flocks in those districts with complete security. It would seem that Berwari is divided into two parts, viz.:—Bala (Upper) and Zir (Lower); Berwari Bala is by far the more considerable, and contains numerous villages; and I am told that two-thirds of the lands here belong to the Nestorians, who have been able to collect their rents without trouble.

The Vali to-day told me that he considered it would be advantageous to establish a military cordon, or build a small barracks, as has been proposed on a previous occasion, at a village named Destan in the Zab Valley between Chal and Berwari, the position of which is excellently central, whilst communication with the town of Amadiah at seven hours' distance is always easy; the recurrence of last year's disturbances would thereby be rendered highly improbable. Destan is also not 10 miles from Ashitha, near which resides Tatar Khan Bey, a fanatical Agha of the settled Kurds, and honorary Mudir of his village, who gave considerable encouragement to the late disturbances.

The Mutessarif Hekkiari, Tahir Bey, bears a good character; he is, at all events, upright and honest, but the administration requires firm and delicate handling, and assuredly the appearance of more force than there is at present; for, in such border districts, there is the danger of the Aghas and Notables playing into the hands of a neighbouring foreign Power, if only in view of the remote possibility of the country in which are their lands and property, passing one day into the possession of that Power.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

P.S. *January* 18.—I hear that Mosoul is fortunate in gaining the services of Reshid Pasha as Vali, in place of Ali Kemali Pasha: it is possible he may be induced to take measures to settle the Heriki, Hartoushi, Miran, and other tribes within the vilayet, and stop their annual migration into Hekkiari.

G. P. D.

No. 19.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received February* 21.)

(No. 71. Confidential.)

Constantinople, February 15, 1889.

My Lord,

WITH reference to the position of the Company who hold the Mersina, Tarsus, and Adana Railway, concerning which your Lordship desired me to make some observations in your despatch No. 26 of the 22nd ultimo, I have the honour to report as follows.

I have no information concerning the line except from hearsay, but I have been told for some time that the present Company were getting into difficulties from want of sufficient available capital and bad management.

I thought that the proceedings of the Committee of Bondholders, and of its Anglo-Dutch members at Constantinople, with regard to this English Company, were certainly deserving of disapprobation, and the result has proved that they could not be justified.

I do not think that hopes could be held out that it would be easy for a new English Company to obtain Concessions for an extension of the present line; such Concessions are always attended with innumerable difficulties and preliminary expenses before they are secured, and on account of our possession of Cyprus and of our occupation of Egypt it would be almost impossible to induce the Sultan to grant such a Concession to an English Company if diplomatic support had to be openly given to it.

Of course it would be very much to be regretted if the existing line was to fall into foreign hands. But it is to be hoped that some English capitalist may be found willing to try what he could do here in the way of improving the present Concession by purely private efforts with influential parties in the capital.

I see from Sir H. D. Wolff's despatches that an American citizen, Mr. Clergue, is in the field contemplating the construction of a line through Bagdad. In the promotion of such an extensive line, the possession of the Concession now held by the present Company would be very valuable as a proper departure for further negotiations with the Ottoman Government.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

No. 20.

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received February* 26.)

Lambeth Palace, February 25, 1889.

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to thank your Lordship for your letter of the 29th January, and the despatches which it contained (which I return herewith), on the subject of the relations between the Mussulman Kurds and the Nestorian Christians.

I am glad to learn from these despatches that the danger of serious disturbances, which last year seemed imminent, is for the present, at all events, averted; and it is satisfactory to note, that although the point of view from which these disturbances are regarded by Colonel Bell (whose information on this particular subject seems to have been altogether derived from an Armenian Inspector of Roads, near Erzeroum), and by Mr. Riley, is somewhat different, there is in Colonel Chermside's despatch substantial confirmation of the fact that the Kurdish raid upon the Nestorians had taken place, and that shocking outrages had attended it. I observe also that Mr. Devey reports that Sheikh Nourallah has been exiled for the part which he took in the matter, and that, in his opinion, the local officials of the Mosul Government were to blame for not discouraging the anti-Christian agitation among the Kurds in its earlier phases.

I readily perceive the difficulty which Colonel Chermside mentions of securing permanent safeguards against such disturbances among wild and unsettled populations, and in a country which does not pay the costs of its own Government, and I need not say that I recognize the fact, which your Lordship alludes to, that Her Majesty's Government have no right to claim a Protectorate of the Nestorians. But I am glad to think that, under the watchful eye of such an officer as Colonel Chermside, and with the powerful influence of Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople in the background, there is every reason to hope that the Nestorian Christians will be safe from a recurrence of the danger which lately threatened them.

I may add that possibly Colonel Russell, who was Consul at Van during the time when these disturbances were taking place, would be found able to give accurate details of the facts with any further information that might be desired.

Thanking your Lordship for your interest in these Christian tribes, which through the greatest trouble and poverty cling firmly to their faith, and appeal to us for a little assistance, in education only, and not in politics, I have, &c.

(Signed) EDW. CANTUAR.

No. 21.

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received February* 28.)

Lambeth Palace, February 27, 1889.

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to thank your Lordship for kindly sending me the despatch of Her Majesty's Vice-Consul at Van, dated the 9th January, which I have read with great interest and now return.

The despatch is very encouraging to us who have a special interest in the Nestorian Christians, and gives promise of greater security in the future for them against the neighbouring Kurds. I trust that the suggestions made by Mr. Devey as to defensive measures may in time be carried out.

With my sincere thanks to him as well as to your Lordship for your kind interest in the matter, I have, &c.

(Signed) EDW. CANTUAR.

No. 22.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.

(No. 68.)

Sir, *Foreign Office, February 28, 1889.*

WITH reference to your Excellency's despatches No. 2 of the 2nd January and No. 27 of the 20th January, I transmit herewith a copy of a letter from his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury on the subject of the relations between the Mussulman Kurds and the Nestorian Christians.*

His Grace suggests that Mr. Russell, who was Vice-Consul at Van at the time of the disturbances, might be able to furnish some useful information, and I have accordingly to request your Excellency to call upon that gentleman for a Report.

Mr. Vice-Consul Devey's despatch No. 3, inclosed in your Excellency's despatch No. 64 of the 12th ultimo, was also communicated to his Grace; and I annex a copy of a letter containing his comments thereon, which has just been received.†

I am, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 23.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received March 7.)

(No. 75. Confidential.)

My Lord, *Constantinople, February 22, 1889.*

WITH his despatch No. 6 of the 1st instant, of which a copy is inclosed, Colonel Chermside has sent me copy of a Report No. 7 from Mr. Devey, setting forth certain facts in connection with prosecutions of Armenians, showing a state of things in that district which I can hardly suppose exists there with the Sultan's knowledge.

Your Lordship is aware, from previous Reports of mine, that my action with His Imperial Majesty on Armenian subjects is greatly paralyzed by the interpretation which evil-disposed persons are constantly giving to the interest or sympathy which Her Majesty's Government or this Embassy may happen to show at any time in the condition of that race.

In fact, next to Egypt, the Sultan is most sensitive with regard to England on subjects connected with Arabia or Armenia. In this instance, however, I have considered that it was impossible for me not to take some step by which His Imperial Majesty might learn from me the serious charges which reached Her Majesty's Embassy as to the conduct of the local authorities at Van.

I therefore instructed Sir A. Sandison to place in the hands of Sureya Pasha, the Sultan's First Secretary, a Turkish Memorandum, giving an account of the information I had received, and this unofficially, and "à titre de renseignement."

Sir A. Sandison reported on the 19th instant that he had carried out my instructions, and that Sureya Pasha promised to lay this Turkish Memorandum before the Sultan. I beg to inclose an English translation of it.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 23.

Consul Chermside to Sir W. White.

Sir, *Erzeroum, February 1, 1889.*

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Excellency copies, in duplicate, of despatches from Her Britannic Majesty's Vice-Consul at Van.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HERBERT CHERMSIDE, *Colonel.*

---

* No. 20.

† No. 21.

Inclosure 2 in No. 23.

Vice-Consul Devey to Consul Chermside.

Sir, *Van, January 21, 1889.*

I REGRET to have to report the continued persecution of the Armenians for past faults and misconception.

You will remember that a small police force was organized here nearly four years ago (*vide* Mr. Lamb's despatch of 24th December, 1885, and Mr. Barnham's despatch of 27th January, 1887). These agents at once set to work to find out, and put down, any existing movements which might be qualified as of a seditious nature. Any attempt at association among the Armenians, whether for social, educational, or other purpose, was at once stopped, and numerous exilings and imprisonment of persons holding advanced views followed: they appear to have completely exhausted the list of such offences (in some cases possibly there was no offence), and now, whilst the system of espionage, both on Armenian correspondence and on their private acts, is at its zenith, so that any seditionary movement is quite impossible, for occupation they have fallen back upon the period from 1878 to 1883. By our law, a positive criminal act can only be punished; but here, a suspected criminal intent of many years back is quite sufficient to entail banishment or equal disgrace. I hear that the Gregorian Patriarch at Constantinople is taking steps to procure a general amnesty for past seditious offences, and earnestly trust that the acute persecution here may shortly be modified.

It would be, perhaps, not amiss to mention here a few instances of these proceedings as conducted by Dervish Effendi, the Tabour Aghassi, an ignorant ruffian, a disgrace to his Government and his country, who scandalously and abominably abuses the office intrusted to him; his shameless conduct precludes description. Not to digress, however: after the famine years, 1879—1881, a subscription was raised and a Society founded for the maintenance and education of about a score of orphaned children; one or two small clubs and mutual benefit Societies also existed, and it is the members of these that are now summoned or arrested and brutally interrogated, as though they were guilty of the blackest treason. Further, a list of upwards of forty names of suspects has been made out, and individuals are constantly called up to certify to this list of "muzirr" (harmful) persons, under pain of their own names appearing in it if they refuse to turn "moukhber" (denouncer). It would seem that the whole number will shortly be incriminated on each other's word through intimidation.

I have, &c.

(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

Inclosure 3 in No. 23.

Memorandum.

(Translation.)

ACCORDING to trustworthy information received from Van, a Police Commission was formed there four years ago to investigate every action taken by the Americans of that place, and to prevent anything considered as an intrigue. Upon this the Armenians were prevented henceforward from assembling in Council to deliberate on such matters as public education, &c., and very many persons were arrested, from amongst whom those who held the most liberal opinions were imprisoned and exiled.

To-day, considering the stringent measures taken to spy into and investigate all Armenian action and correspondence, it is naturally impossible for the Armenians to undertake any intrigue.

In order that this Police Commission shall not remain idle, it is employing itself with examining into all that happened from 1878 to 1883 A.D., so that if any Armenians was suspected of misdemeanour or crime several years ago, this is sufficient to bring exile or other punishment upon him to-day.

It is clear that the conduct of the Major of Gendarmerie of this Commission, being entirely opposed to the Imperial justice, cannot be permitted by the Imperial Government. After the famine and distress, which lasted from 1879 to 1881, subscriptions were opened, and, amongst other charitable associations, a Society was founded to educate twenty poor orphan children; now the members of those associations

are being summoned, arrested, and put under examination as if they had committed a crime.

Besides this, a list is drawn up containing the names of, say, forty dangerous individuals; numerous persons are then pressed to give evidence that the contents of this document are true, and that the individuals named therein do belong to the criminal class, and if any refuse to give such evidence they are threatened with having their own names inserted in the list. In this manner, by degrees, the whole of the inhabitants can be incriminated in one way or another.

No. 24.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received March 7.)

(No. 92. Confidential.)

Constantinople, March 2, 1889.

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship copy of a despatch addressed by Mr. Devey, Her Majesty's Vice-Consul at Van, to Colonel Chermside, Her Majesty's Consul at Erzeroun, respecting the history of a family of Notables named Temir Oglou, resident at Van.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 24.

Vice-Consul Devey to Consul Chermside.

(Confidential.)

Van, January 17, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to inclose a statement respecting the history and the prominent members of the Temir Oglou, a family of Notables of Van. More information about their character and doings may be had on referring to the papers mentioned in the margin.*

The Temir Oglous are very wealthy, and possess broad lands, though some of their titles might be invalidated, and farms in several cazas. Their riches are derived from what they have gained, honestly or dishonestly, as Government servants, and also from their dealings with the Kurds, and from usury most rigorously exacted. Of local Notable families among the Moslems, the Temir Oglou is first, and there is no second. Hassan Effendi, however, the Head of the Dilaver-Zade family, who preceded Temir Oglou Tahir Pasha as President of the Municipality, and is now a member of the Cadi's Court, has considerable local influence, and enjoys high repute among Kurdish Sheikhs for his religious zeal and piety, and for his moral conduct. It appears that two parties were formed here under the leadership of Hassan Effendi and of Tahir Pasha, and their constant bickerings and rival interests, whether in respect of private property and rights or on account of personal jealousy and intrigues for nomination to local Government appointments, have combined in no small degree to hamper the administration and impede the course of justice. For the last few years the Temir Oglou faction seems to have been in the ascendant, but when the present Vali came to Van he found that many abuses were obtaining (notably the sale of tithes among the employés, which, being criminal, he promptly put down), and as countless instances of misconduct could be adduced against the Temir Oglous, whether in this or in other respects, he resolved to depart from the line followed by his predecessors, and to accord them no longer the favour of the Imperial Government.

There is no doubt that the Temir Oglous have very great influence among the Kurds throughout the whole country lying between Van and Bashkaleh, along the frontier, and from Eljivaz to Bayazid, and one may hear them speak of "our Tahir Pasha" in the most affectionate and respectful terms. Members of the family have

* Captain Clayton to Her Majesty's Ambassador, No. 51, December 15, 1880; Captain Clayton to Major Trotter, No. 3, August 19, No. 15, October 26, No. 18, November 1, No. 24, November 22, and No. 31, December 30, 1879; No. 2, February 2, No. 13, April 20, and No. 25, August 10, 1880; No. 1, January 4, 1881; Mr. Eyres to Colonel Everett, No. 2, Confidential, January 7, 1884; Mr. Lamb to Sir W. White, No. 8, December 24, No. 9, December 29, 1885; Mr. Barnham to Sir W. White, No. 1, January 27, No. 5, March 18, No. 7, April 26, 1887.

had constant relations with them on Government and private business of every kind, and have often sheltered them from the pursuit of justice for crimes of violence, oppression, robbery, and murder. They have, in short, constituted a means of communication, and sometimes of preventing friction, between the local authorities and the tribes; nor has their influence always been misapplied and disastrous. At the close of the war it is said that Ghalib Pasha, whilst travelling about between this and Abagha, exerted himself with good results in pacifying the Kurds, and averting an expected outbreak, if not a massacre, of the Christians.

Mr. Lamb remarks (Report of the 24th December, 1885): ". . . . . The family is so powerful that at no time could a Vali afford to risk an open breach." During the weak administration of Hamid Pasha such might have been the case; but the present Vali has shown his will and ability to check and thwart them. He has even disabused them of the idea that their persons and property were sacred; and Khorshid Bey has seen the inside of a prison. The root of their influence with the Kurds lies in their being supported and favoured by the Government; ever since last August they have been openly avowed enemies of the Vali, but the results of their resentment have not as yet been very evident. Ghalib Pasha resigned his membership of the Idaré Medjliss. This was not accepted, and he continues to attend the sittings irregularly. Tahir Pasha set himself to get up a "mazbata" against the Vali; a telegram was also sent two months ago to the Porte, complaining in detail of their being persecuted. This telegram was followed by the appeal to His Imperial Majesty the Sultan of the four self-styled insulted members, recalling their past faithful services, &c., which formed the subject of my cypher telegram of yesterday. Finally, they have of late been doing their utmost to put forward complaints, Armenian and Kurdish, and to incite people, not for the sake of getting justice done, but of attacking the Vali, to air old grievances. His Excellency the Vali perhaps under-estimates their power. He assured me that, supposing a scale of 100, 90 per cent. might have been assigned to Sheikh Obeydullah, but not more than ten to the Temir Oglous, and that were it a question (not that any such project exists) of exiling them, root and branch, he should not feel the least anxiety nor take any unusual precaution, but simply execute the order as in the case of any other person.

Khorshid Bey was last winter at Constantinople, where he obtained the Mutessariflik of Bashkaleh on payment, I believe, of £T. 400. He however only enjoyed the Governorship for about three months, for when the vilayet became again a sandjak he was left in charge temporarily, but, despite all his own and his friends' efforts, failed to retain the post. I hear that he proved thoroughly corrupt, as was also Fikri Pasha, the lately deceased Vali; he was, besides, suspected of inciting the Kurds to disorder and against the Nestorians: it is possible that these reports were not without foundation. In any case, the Vali took advantage of the suspicion or circumstantial evidence to cause the ex-Mutessarif to be arrested, and his house to be searched during his Excellency's absence last August; the Mektubji and Acting Vali, Enyari Effendi, was charged with conducting the search in order not to offend the susceptibilities of the Temir Oglous more than necessary, but it proved fruitless, having been secretly betrayed beforehand. Dubious letters with Khorshid's signature had previously been seized, and the Temir Oglou partizans assert these letters to have been the work of a Kurd of Bashkaleh, Feizullah Bey,* and the Muhasebeji Kiatibi (Writer in the Accountant's Department) of Hekkiari Vilayet, acting with the Van Vali's connivance. The letters were denied by Khorshid Bey, and he was released from custody. Whilst Khorshid Bey was still Governor at Bashkaleh, Tahir Pasha applied for the Mutessarillik of Bayazid; the following facts were related to me by the Vali. Seven or eight months ago Tahir Pasha received a telegraphic message from Constantinople, to the effect that "the affair was arranged, and he was to remit the £T. 600." His Excellency being informed of this set a watch on Tahir's proceedings, learnt he was buying a draft for the sum named, and on the following mail day seized it privately at the post-office, together with a registered letter which expressed his thanks and advised his remittance of the money "for the property he was purchasing at Bayazid." The draft and the letter the Vali retained, and has still in his possession.

With Ghalib Pasha at Van, Tahir Pasha at Bayazid, and Khorshid Bey at Bashkaleh, with their influence among the Kurds throughout this district and all along the north of Lake Van, with the two frontiers edging the two Mutessarifliks, and the considerable distance from the only military centre—Erzeroum, it will be

* This man has just been released from prison. I hope to see him shortly.

plain that the Government authority would have been practically abdicated in favour of the Temir Oglous,—in short, it would have been a return to the old system of Deve Bey government, plus special facilities for foreign intrigue.

The Vali spent some months in travelling in the districts in the summers of both 1887 and 1888. I regret that I cannot consider his praiseworthy efforts to conciliate the Kurds entirely successful. The administration has, however, been improved, and it is positive the Government is every year gaining in respect and power, and I venture to think that Imperial interests will prove to have been served by the Governor-General's behaviour in regard to the Temir Oglou family, which might almost have been regulated on the lines of the old Turkish maxim, of never allowing a subject to grow too wealthy and too powerful.

From the information submitted, you will perhaps be able to form an opinion as to what policy the Porte might pursue with advantage in respect of this family, for the existing discord is a rather serious trouble. In conclusion, I have only to say that I am personally unacquainted with these Notables, but that the opinion of my Russian colleague regarding them is not absolutely unfavourable.

I have, &c.

(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

Inclosure 2 in No. 24.

Statement respecting the Temir Oglou Family of Van.

THE family is said to have been originally exiled from Koniah, and come to reside in Armenia about the middle of the eighteenth century. One of the members —Dervish Bey—was Mutessarif at Van in 1819. He revolted, and, crossing into Persia, was joined by the Khan of Khoi, and returned to besiege and take Van. Sert Mahmoud Pasha was dispatched with troops against him, and his brother-in-law having been seized as a hostage Dervish Bey was betrayed, disguised as a woman, by his sister, and executed. Isag Bey, a relation, was then appointed Governor of Van, but in 1826 Temir Pasha, who has given his name to the family, usurped his place. Isag resisted, the Armenians sent complaints, but Temir Pasha bribes to Erzeroum. After a longish struggle Isag fled. Temir Pasha then formed an alliance with the Kurds and Yezids, and Amir Khan of Persia, and a province was promised to Persia if the revolt should be successful. This was in 1831, and the Erzeroum Vali and Mush Mutessarif now came to besiege Van. Temir Pasha was compelled to take refuge in the stronghold of Khoshab whilst Isag Bey was brought back. Temir Pasha some time afterwards got himself appointed Mutessarif of Bayazid by means of bribery, but presently, reverting to his former insolence, sent stones in lieu of taxes. Esad Pasha then crushed him, and sent him as a prisoner and exile to Constantinople, whilst Isag Bey was honourably banished to Mush. In 1845, Sirri Pasha visited Van for the purpose of superintending the carrying out of the Hatti-Sherif of Gulhané. The Temir Oglous, now represented by Keur Mustafa and a second Dervish Bey, at once resisted, and stirred up the people to reject the Tanzimat. Sirri Pasha was driven away. They then joined Khan Mahmoud of Vostan and the region to the south-east of Lake Van, who was a lieutenant of Beder Kam Bey, of Bohtan and Sert; and it was agreed that Beder Kam Bey should be recognized as Ruler over all Kurdistan whilst Keur Mustafa should be Governor at Van, and the country divided into districts to reward the allies and members of the family. Two years later the Mushir Osman Pasha arrived at Van, and quickly put down the revolt. The Kurds fled, peace was re-established, and Beder Kam Bey and others exiled. Dervish Bey however returned, to be again banished to Erzeroum by Munir Pasha, where he died.

Existing Members of the Family.

Tahir Pasha (age 50-55).—President of the Municipality for the last ten years. Has served as Mudir at Eljivaz, Nufuss Naziri, and member of the Idaré Council. Special protector of highway robbers. Said to have twice caused the mail to be attacked and plundered; on one occasion a large sum in cash was stolen, and the Government, being unable to trace the culprits, applied to him, who caused innocent Kurds to be punished in consequence, and a subscription to be raised among others with whom he was not friendly, that the money might be refunded.

Ghalib Pasha.—Uncle to Tahir Pasha. Has been Kaïmakam at Eljivaz, Mutessarif of Mush, and President of the Criminal Court here, Acting Vali, and member of the Idaré Council during the last three years. Has served on roads and other Committees, and often been sent to collect sheep tax and tithes. Behaved scandalously whilst on the latter business last summer in Eljivaz; his morality and cruelty are infamous. For character as Jeza Reis, see Captain Clayton's despatch of the 15th December, 1880. On one occasion he hushed up the theft of a quantity of Government rifles intended to be sent into Persia.

Hassan Bey.—Brother of Ghalib Pasha. Grandsons of Isag Bey mentioned in the historical sketch. Has held the post of Kaïmakam at Arjish, Bitlis, Gevver, and Shattakh, member of Appeal Court, and was dismissed from the Nufuss Naziret eight weeks ago. Captain Clayton describes his character (10th August, 1880).

Khorshid Bey.—Brother of Tahir Pasha. Has been Kaïmakam at Bergri, Arjish, and Gevver; also Mutessarif at Bashkaleh. The Hartoushi tribe of Hekkiari were to pay £ T. 1,500 taxes. Khorshid Bey, in connivance with the late Vali, declared them to be too poor to pay anything at all, and soon afterwards received a present of £ T. 600 from their Chief.

The above four persons represent the family to-day. Hadji Yusuf Bey, who was the head of the family before Tahir Pasha, and perhaps the only respectable member, is dead. Other relations are Nouri Bey (*vide* Captain Clayton's despatch of the 15th December, 1880), son of Temir Pasha (mentioned in the historical sketch), now Kaïmakam for Shemdina, and Khourrem Bey, his brother, who has been Kaïmakam at Eljivaz and Arjish, and on the "Evkaf" Board. Jelal Bey, who has been employed at Bitlis, and Nussret Bey, who collects taxes, but holds no office. Safvet Bey, son of Hassan Bey, writer to the Juge d'Instruction here. Zeinal (Zein-el-Abeddin) Bey, son of Ghalib Pasha, and Haïdar Bey, son of Khorshid Bey, live at home and look after the property.

(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

Van, January 17, 1889.

No. 25.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.

(No. 85.)

Sir, *Foreign Office, March* 9, 1889.

I HAVE received and laid before the Queen your despatch No. 75, Confidential, of the 22nd ultimo, respecting the state of affairs at Van, and the persecution of the Armenians in that district.

Her Majesty's Government approve the steps which you have taken to bring the proceedings of the local authorities to the notice of His Majesty the Sultan.

I am, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 26.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.

(No. 109.)

Sir, *Foreign Office, March* 29, 1889.

THE Turkish Ambassador, in conversation the other day with Sir James Fergusson, referred to the "Haiasdan" newspaper, and Mr. Bryce's question in the House of Commons respecting Armenia.

His Excellency said that this paper contained grossly calumnious statements, viz., that the Turkish Government designed to exterminate the Armenians, and had made it lawful for every Armenian to have four wives.

Alluding to the conversation which your Excellency had with the Armenian Patriarch in the month of December last, he said that he understood that the Patriarch had disclaimed all connection with this paper, and had deplored its tone as likely to have an injurious effect upon Armenian interests.

Rustem Pasha proceeded to say that the Sultan wished to deal justly with the Armenians as with all his subjects, and that the reports to which he had alluded were invented by conspirators against the Government.

He said that there were occasionally Kurdish raids, but that they were repressed, and large bodies of police were employed to maintain order. The Porte selected the

best officers at its disposal for the Armenian provinces, and his Excellency maintained that the improvement there, as well as in the other provinces of the Empire, was very remarkable.

Sir J. Fergusson observed, in reply, that Her Majesty's Government had, as his Excellency knew, abstained from pressing the Porte on the subject, in spite of the reports which had reached them, that the Armenians were suffering from considerable hardships, for they knew the difficulties with which the Porte had to contend.

Though full credence was not to be attached to all the reports which appeared in the papers, yet he feared that the Armenians did suffer from inadequate protection, if not from undue severity.

Sir J. Fergusson said that personally he was entirely in favour of the policy of alliance between Turkey and England, which he believed to be in accordance with the true interests of this country, and he pointed out to his Excellency that this policy must necessarily be hindered by a belief that administrative reforms were not carried out, and that the receipt of well-founded reports of sufferings endured by Rayah subjects of the Sultan must operate injuriously to the interests of the Ottoman Empire.

In conclusion, he observed that it would be impossible to prevent debates in the House of Commons if accounts of real hardships were received.

I am, &c.
(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 27.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received April 4.)

(No. 115.)
My Lord, *Constantinople, March* 23, 1889.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 97 of the 9th instant, I have the honour to forward herewith copy of a despatch from Her Majesty's Consul-General at Beyrout reporting on the appointment of Raïf Pasha as Governor-General of that vilayet.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE

Inclosure in No. 27.

Consul-General Eldridge to Sir W. White.

Sir, *Beyrout, March* 11, 1889.

WITH reference to my despatch of the 5th instant, reporting the death of Ali Pasha, the Vali of Beyrout, I have the honour to inform your Excellency that news has been received by telegraph of the appointment of Raïf Pasha in the place of the defunct Ali Pasha.

This appointment has given general satisfaction to all classes of the population of the vilayet, where his Excellency is well known, as he was Governor of Beyrout in difficult times—during the war with Russia—when he displayed great tact and ability in preserving order at a time when the lower and ignorant classes of the Moslem population were greatly excited against the Christians, considering the war as one of Islamism against infidels.

Raïf Pasha was subsequently Governor of Beyrout during the time of Midhat Pasha (1879-80), and from my personal relations with him during these two periods I am of opinion that the Ottoman Government could not have made a better choice for this important office; indeed, I was on the point of suggesting, by telegraph, to your Excellency that you should recommend him to the Grand Vizier for the post.

The reputation which Raïf Pasha has left here is that of an honest, active, and intelligent official, and he will be received with open arms by all his old friends, myself the first.

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. JACKSON ELDRIDGE.

No. 28.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received April 4.)

(No. 124.)
My Lord, *Constantinople, March* 29, 1889.

ON the receipt of your Lordship's despatch No. 68 of the 28th ultimo I transmitted to Mr. Russell a copy of the letter from his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and instructed him to furnish me with any further information on the subject of the relations between the Mussulman Kurds and the Nestorian Christians.

There is little new in Mr. Russell's reply, copy of which is herewith inclosed, but he points out the difficulty in the way of a Consul at Van obtaining reliable information unless he has reliable agents on the spot where the disturbances take place.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 28.

Vice-Consul Russell to Sir W. White.

Sir, *Dardanelles, March* 24, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's despatch dated the 12th instant, inclosing a copy of a letter addressed to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State by his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury concerning the relations between the Kurds and Nestorian Christians, and also a request from your Excellency for me to furnish a Report on the question.

I have the honour to inform your Excellency that I left with Mr. Vice-Consul Devey some of the Rev. W. H. Browne's letters which refer to this matter. I also had the honour to send to your Excellency two letters in original which I had received from that gentleman during my residence at Van, and extracts from other letters of his.

In the month of August 1888 the Rev. W. H. Browne received instructions from his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury not to report to me the tyrannies taking place in his part of the country, and as Van is a long distance from the scene of the disturbances, which occurred in another vilayet, it was impossible for me to obtain further information.

A few days before I left Van I heard again that it was quite true that the Kurds did in the winter arrange a plan to wreck Tiari, and had asked help from Tkhorna, and that there was also a scheme to deprive the Ashirets of their arms, which could not have been carried out without bloodshed, and that the Kurds did assemble near Ashutu, and had ravished a large number of women and had killed two of them.

I beg to say that unless Her Majesty's Vice-Consul at Van had reliable agents in those mountainous districts, or unless he went himself to verify rumours of disturbances or bloodshed which might reach Van in an exaggerated form, it would be simply impossible for him to give a trustworthy report of what was going on in those savage parts of Kurdistan.

I am, &c.
(Signed) J. F. RUSSELL.

No. 29.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received April 18.)

(No. 142.)
My Lord, *Constantinople, April* 13, 1889.

WITH reference to your Lordship's despatch No. 293 of the 20th September last, I have the honour to state that the difficulties with regard to the election of a Protestant Vekil have terminated with the appointment of M. Boyadjian.

The question has been pending since 1887, when the last Vekil resigned, and the inclosed Memorandum by Mr. Block gives an account of all the difficulties in connection with this appointment. The Imperial Iradé was communicated to M. Boyadjian on the 13th ultimo, and he was also granted an audience of His Imperial Majesty the Sultan.

Mr. Block has also, at my request, drawn up a Memorandum giving a clear and

compendious history of the Protestant community since 1847, of the elections of the three Vekils, and an account of the various attempts to obtain a "constitution." This paper, which has been drawn up with much care, may be of interest to your Lordship.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 29.

Memorandum by Mr. Block respecting the Election of a Protestant Vekil.

IN my immediately-preceding Memorandum of this day's date concerning the Protestant community, I stated that in 1887 Agop Matteosian, the then Vekil, resigned. Thereupon the Ministry of Public Worship authorized the native Protestants to proceed to the election of a new Vekil.

The community split into two parties, the one insisting on the right of election by the Protestant National Council ("Millet Medjlissi"), supposed to be composed of representatives of the community in the whole Empire, and the other advocating the election by the Notables of Constantinople. The latter had the support of the Ministry of Public Worship and elected M. Boyadjian.

M. Boyadjian had in former years been the leading spirit in the so-called National Council, but had separated from them, not approving some of the decisions and acts of the Council.

The Council elected a certain M. Djedjizian, and at this stage of the proceedings Her Majesty's Embassy was appealed to by each party to obtain the sanction of the Imperial Government for its nominee, which each party contended had been legally chosen representative of the community. The Turkish Government, unable to decide the claims of the two disputants, remained passive.

Her Majesty's Embassy endeavoured to reconcile the two parties without success, and at the Porte restricted its action to urging the Porte to postpone the election of the Vekil until the Protestants could settle their differences with regard to the mode of election.

I should mention here that the chief reason for which the Porte declined to accept the candidature of M. Djedjizian was that in its opinion the "Millet Medjlissi," or National Council, had no authorized or legal status. Her Majesty's Embassy then endeavoured to persuade the Porte to settle upon a mode of election satisfactory to both parties, as reported to Lord Salisbury by his Excellency Sir W. White in his despatch of the 22nd June, 1888, but, finally, the Porte decided to appoint M. Boyadjian, and his name was sent to the Palace for Imperial sanction. His Excellency the Ambassador reported this stage of the proceedings to Lord Salisbury in his despatch of the 11th September, 1888, in which his Excellency stated that it might be well that the Protestants should now settle their differences and should avail themselves of M. Boyadjian's influence with the Turkish Government to obtain the "constitution" they have so long desired, but have been hitherto unable to obtain, in which "constitution" the mode of election would be settled for the future. Lord Salisbury approved of this attitude in his despatch of the 20th September, 1888.

Matters, however, dragged on, and it was evident that the Turkish Government, taking advantage of the circumstances, would move no further, unless some external pressure was brought to bear; so unsatisfactory a state of things was prejudicial to the community itself and forced Her Majesty's Embassy to take unofficial action at the Porte with regard to matters concerning Protestant complaints which properly came within the scope of the Vekil's action. Repeated applications were, moreover, made to Her Majesty's Embassy to induce the Porte to act in accordance with the Imperial Firmans and by appointing a Vekil to put an end to a state of affairs which was considered a grievance and an injustice. Accordingly you, Sir, and myself, were again instructed to insist at the Porte, with the Grand Vizier and the Minister of Public Worship, on the appointment of an Agent or Vekil, which Her Majesty's Embassy considered it had a right to demand, declining to enter into any personal question as to who should be the occupant of the post. Finally, in the month of March His Majesty issued his Imperial Iradé appointing M. Boyadjian as Vekil, and his appointment was communicated to him on the 13th March last.

M. Boyadjian has called on Her Majesty's Ambassador thanking him, on behalf of the community, and for the continuation of his friendly action on behalf of the native Protestants, which has been constant and uninterrupted since the time of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe.

On the 6th April M. Boyadjian was summoned to the Palace, with the Armenian Patriarch and the Grand Rabbi; after they had all been received in audience together, M. Boyadjian had another audience alone, in which His Majesty stated as follows: "I am glad to see you on this occasion. I congratulate you on your appointment, and I wish you all success in your office. It is my wish that all my subjects, without distinction in the matter of their faith and worship, should have perfect equality and liberty, and that no one should molest them."

I may add, in conclusion, that I am given to understand that the two parties are gradually reuniting, and will no doubt eventually act in concert under M. Boyadjian's supervision.

(Signed) ADAM BLOCK.

Constantinople, April 9, 1889.

Inclosure 2 in No. 29.

Memorandum by Mr. Block respecting the Armenian Protestants.

IN June 1846 a Vizirial letter, instructing the Pasha of Erzeroum to see that the civil rights of the Protestants were not infringed so long as they were faithful subjects of the Sultan, is, as far as I am able to ascertain, the first document ever issued by the Turkish Government for the protection of its Protestant subjects.

The English, Prussian, and American Ministers at Constantinople had for some time past been using their influence to protect the Protestants from persecution and to procure for them a guarantee for their civil rights, but it was Lord Stratford de Redcliffe who contributed chiefly to this issue by his energetic and unceasing action during many years in urging upon the Turkish Government the necessity of securing to its Protestant subjects the right of pursuing their lawful callings without molestation.

In the year 1847 Lord Cowley exerted himself to obtain for the Protestant Armenians a distinct recognition on the part of the Porte and a formal organization which should place them on the same footing as the other religious communities of the Empire, and on the 15th November, 1847, Lord Cowley received from the Minister for Foreign Affairs copy of a Vizirial letter, signed by Reshid Pasha, recognizing the native Protestants as constituting a separate community in Turkey.

The part taken by Lord Cowley led the missionaries to address to him a letter of acknowledgment, dated the 21st December, 1847. In the letter mention is made of the efficient instrumentality of Lord Stratford, as well as of the humane and liberal policy of the British Government itself. Lord Cowley's reply to the missionaries of the Armenian Board is dated the 28th December, 1847.

Lord Stratford, on his return to his post in 1850, lost no time in again making representations to the Porte on behalf of the Protestant Armenians, and in that year an Imperial Firman was granted to them by Sultan Abdul Medjid. Among other privileges, the Protestants were authorized "to appoint from among themselves, and by their own selection, a faithful and trustworthy person with the title of "Agent of the Protestants" ("Protestan Vekili"), for the purpose of facilitating the conduct of their affairs. This Firman is dated Mouharrem 1267, year of the Hegira.

In April 1853 (Shaban 12, 1269) Sultan Abdul Medjid granted a "Hatti-Sherif" to his Protestant subjects addressed to Stefan, the then Vekil of the Protestant community, and almost simultaneously with this, a special Circular in favour of the Protestants was addressed to the Pashas and Governors in the interior, in whose jurisdiction Protestants were known to exist, repeating the injunctions of the Firman first issued and enforcing the same by more positive and stringent orders.

Thus in 1269, viz., 1853, Stefan Agha, who was a brother of the Armenian Patriarch, was the first Protestant Vekil.

He was elected by the Constantinople native Protestant Notables in an informal manner, and his election was confirmed by the Firman of 1853, obtained partly through the agency of Lord Stratford.

Stefan Agha was burned in the great fire of Stamboul of 1865. During his tenure of office a so-called representative Council existed, and its members, the number of which varied from time to time, were nominated in an informal manner by Protestants in the provinces, *i.e.*, from time to time the Notables of Constantinople instructed the

provincial native Protestants to name as their representative on the Council some leading member of the community at Constantinople, which they obediently did. One of the members was M. Boyadjian, the present Vekil, who, after studying in America, returned to Constantinople in 1859 and was informed that he had been elected Deputy for Diarbekir.

The community had no "constitution," but certain rules were approved of by the community, according to which they managed their internal affairs, and in virtue of which the so-called representative Council existed, but these rules were not recognized by, or even known to, the Turkish Government.

On the death of Stefan, his secretary, Daoud Ghazaros, prevailed upon the "Beilikdji Bey" (the Grand Chancellor of the Imperial Divan at the Porte), who was a friend of his, to appoint a new Vekil. The "Beilikdji" agreed, and a meeting of four Armenian Protestants of Constantinople, among whom was Ghazaros, was called together, and each man elected himself; the names were given to the "Beilikdji," who appointed Ghazaros. Ghazaros then addressed a Petition to His Majesty, saying that the Firman given to Stefan had been burnt at his death and asking for a copy, and a Firman was accordingly granted addressed to Ghazaros, repeating almost word for word the Firman granted to Stefan (this was in 1284). Ghazaros held the post for two years, working under similar rules to his predecessor, but his conduct not meeting with the entire approval of the community nor of the Porte, the "Beilikdji," who seems at that time to have been the chief mover in these matters, caused a meeting of Protestant Armenians to be called and obtained from them a request for a new Vekil. Ghazaros was dismissed, and the leading members of the community came to an understanding with the party of Ghazaros and his brother-in-law, by which the various quarters of the capital should be requested to send delegates, who should proceed to the election of a Vekil and to furnish at the same time the name of the person they considered best fitted for the post. Twenty-four persons were accordingly named as electors, and three names were submitted for election, amongst them that of Bozadjian: he received 18 votes, a certain Minassian 6, and the name of the third, a certain Agob Matteosian, was put aside.

The result of this election was submitted to the "Beilikdji," who stated that it was now too late, since the party of Ghazaros had submitted to him (the "Beilikdji") the name of Matteosian, whom they had elected at a private meeting held in spite of their seeming adherence to the above-mentioned understanding, and that he had already (in twenty-four hours) obtained the Iradé confirming the appointment.

There was nothing to be done but to accept the situation, and Agob Matteosian continued as Vekil till 1884; he received, however, no Firman, but continued to manage the affairs of the community in the same way as his predecessors; he resigned in 1884, but his resignation was not accepted till 1887, when Her Majesty's Embassy was again asked to use its influence to obtain the appointment of a new Vekil, which it did with the result that M. Bozadjian has been elected and appointed in the manner I shall have the honour to relate in a separate Memorandum; he is the fourth Vekil.

I have shown that the Protestant Agents (Vekils) have been hitherto elected in a most informal and irregular manner.

2. I will now attempt to show the steps taken by Her Majesty's Embassy to obtain a "constitution" for the Protestant Armenians.

In 1879 Sir H. Layard, then Her Majesty's Ambassador, seeing the necessity of the Protestant community possessing a regularly recognized "constitution," instructed Mr. Dragoman Marinich to draw up a "constitution" with the help of M. Agob Matteosian, the Vekil; a most elaborate "constitution" was accordingly drawn up, and approved by Sir H. Layard and the German Embassy, and Sir Alfred Sandison was instructed to press the Porte to agree to its being accepted.

This "constitution" was submitted to the Porte by Her Majesty's Embassy in a note of the 28th May, 1880 (Sir H. Layard to Sawas Pasha). A copy of it is to be found in Mr. Marinich's Memorandum of April 1880. It was examined by a Committee at the Porte, but was never put into execution.

Sir H. Layard states in his note that His Majesty the Sultan had told him that he had issued an Iradé for the Protestant "constitution," but that he, Sir H. Layard, had reason to believe that the "constitution," which had been submitted by the Porte, and approved of by Her Majesty, was one which had already been rejected by the Protestant community as containing unacceptable clauses; and in his despatch to Lord Granville of the 1st June, 1880, Sir H. Layard explained that he had learned that a deception had been practised upon His Majesty, and His Majesty had been

No. 30*.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received May* 13.)

(No. 163.)

My Lord, *Constantinople, April* 30, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a despatch from Her Majesty's Consul at Erzeroum, forwarding a despatch from Mr. Vice-Consul Devey on the subject of a complaint against the Mutessarif of Hekkiari by some inhabitants of Bashkaleh, which appears to have made no little stir in those parts.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 30*.

Consul Chermside to Sir W. White.

Sir, *Erzeroum, April* 16, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to forward, for your Excellency's information, two copies of a despatch by Mr. Devey, Her Britannic Majesty's Vice-Consul at Van.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HERBERT CHERMSIDE.

Inclosure 2 in No. 30*.

Vice-Consul Devey to Consul Chermside.

Sir, *Van, March* 30, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to report that upwards of 100 inhabitants of Bashkaleh arrived here ten or twelve days ago for the purpose of laying a formal complaint against the Mutessarif of Hekkiari. A deputation has been formed comprising several Sheikhs, among whom is Sheikh Hamid, member of the Idaré Medjliss of Bashkaleh, a fanatic hated but feared by the Christians; he is by far the most influential man in Hekkiari, and being a relation by marriage of Temir Oglou Khorshid Bey, the late Mutessarif, would naturally be inclined to make difficulties for Tahir Bey, the Governor who replaced him. An attempt has been made to give the deputation a universal character, and Jews and Christians have joined in it. The grounds of complaint appear to be slight; according to the petitioners, Tahir Bey neglects his religious duties, and does not adhere strictly to the precepts of the Koran. His manners and habits are repugnant to the Bashkaleh ideas of propriety. He offended one Sheikh by insisting that his Moslem tenants and retainers should take their share in supplying and transporting fuel for the Government use as well as the Rayas of the neighbourhood. They complain further that he abolished the Municipality of Bashkaleh, which existed merely nominally, and was quite inefficient. He is stated to oppress the people, and in particular to have made a man carry him on his back for two hours, if such an absurd accusation is worth repeating. He is finally charged with bribery, and as an instance is quoted his accepting a mule presented by Marshimoum: I am told that the Mutessarif made a complimentary present of a watch in return.

The complaints in fact appear to be almost entirely frivolous, and I am convinced that no deputation would have come forward had it not been promoted by the urgent solicitations and promises of support of the Temir Oglou family here. Tahir Bey has seen much and varied service in European Turkey and at Kastamboul, but the Hekkiari Mutessariflik is his first experience of remote and uncivilized regions; he is a man of parts, refined and educated, and has administrative capacity and energy: what the Sheikhs have mostly to complain of is that he has taken a firm grasp of the Government, and will not allow them the irresponsibility of action to which they have been so long accustomed.

A preliminary inquiry conducted by the Mufti has already been held here, and yesterday the Vali summoned Sheikhs Hamid and Hassan, to inform them that the complaints had been referred to the Council of State (Shurai Devlet), and that the Mutessarif would return to Bashkaleh pending a decision at Constantinople. The Sheikhs answered they could not think of returning home so long as Tahir Bey remained Governor.

It would be wearisome to enumerate all the moves and intrigues of the Temir Oglou party as opposed to the Vali and the Hassanian fraction since I referred to their proceedings in my despatches of January last. A bombardment of Mazbatas has been kept up, and telegrams or written complaints are constantly addressed to the Sultan, the Porte, and even the Sheikh-ul-Islam on either side. On the 21st instant a long telegram was again sent by the Temir Oglous and their friends, and this has just been answered by a Mazbata in favour of the Vali, signed by 200 of the Hassanian party, and also a number of Armenians, practically intimidated into adding their signatures, for, with the exception of a certain Natanian Garabed Effendi and a few others, they wished to hold aloof.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

---

induced to give his sanction to an unacceptable "constitution." In my Memorandum of the 25th February, 1888, I had the honour to inclose translation of a "Règlement" ("Nizamnamé") for the Protestant community, dated the 11th March, 1878, and this mentions a "constitution" as existing, which must be the objectionable "constitution" referred to by Sir H. Layard.

Sir H. Layard did not succeed in obtaining the approval of the Imperial Government to the "constitution" proposed by him, and there is at the moment, therefore, no duly authorized "constitution."

Hence has arisen to a great extent the present unsatisfactory condition of the relations between the Porte and the community, as well as the confusion in the internal relations of the community, more especially with regard to the mode of election of the Vekil on the last as well as on former occasions; and for this last reason, if for no other, I humbly suggest that M. Boyadjian will be rendering immense service to his co-religionists if he will draw up a "constitution" acceptable to the community at large, and obtain for it the approval and sanction of the Sublime Porte.

(Signed) A. BLOCK.

Constantinople, April 9, 1889.

P.S.—I beg to add that M. Boyadjian has informed me he hopes to be able later to draw up a short history of the community from the documents in their possession, of which he will give a copy to Her Majesty's Embassy.

A. B.

No. 30.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.

(No. 152.)

Sir, *Foreign Office, April* 22, 1889.

I HAVE to request your Excellency to convey to Mr. Block my thanks for the Memorandum on the subject of the history of the Protestant community in Turkey since the year 1847, which you transmitted to me in your despatch No. 142 of the 13th instant.

I am, &c.
(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 31.

Prince Malcom Khan to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received May* 15.)

M. le Marquis, 80, *Holland Park, le* 14 *Mai*, 1889.

D'APRÈS le compte rendu de la séance du 13 courant de la Chambre des Lords, je vois avec surprise qu'à propos des atrocités dont se plaignent les Arméniens de Turquie, l'Ambassadeur Ottoman a dit à votre Excellence que ces atrocités étaient commises par des tribus Kurdes qui venaient du côté de la Perse.

Dans cette assertion, il doit y avoir une erreur; car le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté le Schah ne connaît aucune circonstance où les Arméniens de la Turquie aient jamais formulé des plaintes contre des maux venant de nos frontières. Pour connaître les vrais auteurs de ces atrocités nous n'avons qu'à nous en rapporter aux témoignages de ceux mêmes qui en sont les victimes.

Heureusement l'entente cordiale qui existe aujourd'hui mieux que jamais, entre le Schah et le Sultan, ne permet point de supposer que la Porte cherche à jeter sur un pays voisin et ami la responsabilité des actes que les autorités et l'Ambassadeur Ottomans déplorent avec le monde civilisé.

Agréez, &c.
(Signé) MALCOM.

No. 32.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received May 27, 8 A.M.*)

(No. 26.)
(Telegraphic.) *Constantinople, May 26, 1889, 11 P.M.*

FOLLOWING from Chermside, dated 24th :—

"Your telegram of 15th.

"I am forwarding a despatch concerning Kurdish Chief mentioned. Up to 7th May his retainers held roads near Mush, and he had not been arrested. I have heard of three serious [? outrages] by him or by his followers during past two months, including the murder by fire of Lhan of Arkavaang, near Mush. Turkish military authorities confidentially mentioned that the state of the Van and the Bitlis Vilayets most unsatisfactory owing to bad administration of the Governors, and they suggested representation to the Porte by your Excellency."

No. 33.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.

(No. 31.)
(Telegraphic.) *Foreign Office, May 29, 1889, 1·40 P.M.*

YOUR telegram No. 26 of 26th : Outrages near Mush.

As soon as you have Chermside's despatch, you should make representations to the Porte.

No. 34.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.—(*Substance telegraphed.*)

(No. 190. Ext. 31.)
Sir, *Foreign Office, May 29, 1889.*

HER Majesty's Government have been most painfully impressed on learning from your telegram No. 26 of the 26th instant that the rumours respecting the perpetration of outrages in the neighbourhood of Mush are confirmed, and that the unsatisfactory state of affairs in the Van and Bitlis Vilayets is due in a great measure to the mal-administration of the Governors of these districts.

As soon as you receive Colonel Chermside's detailed Report, you should address suitable representations to the Porte, and urge the adoption of effective measures for the maintenance of security and good government.

I am, &c.
(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 35.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received May 31.*)

(No. 183.)
My Lord, *Constantinople, May 20, 1889.*

DURING the audience given me last night by the Sultan His Imperial Majesty in general avoided politics, but an allusion to the answer given by your Lordship to a question of Lord Carnarvon's in the House of Lords on the evening of the 13th instant gave him an opportunity to express his high appreciation of the spirit of fairness shown by your Lordship in dealing with the internal difficulties of keeping the peace in that distant portion of the Sultan's dominions.

In alluding to this subject His Majesty repeated to me the explanations given you by Rustem Pasha, stating how difficult it was to repress and punish acts of violence committed by Kurdish marauders coming from Persia and again recrossing the frontier.

His Majesty went on to speak of some fanatical sect existing in these distant parts whose practices he compared to those of some wild tribes in America, but whose name, given by him, escaped both Sir Alfred Sandison and myself.

As I was particularly desirous to draw, in as delicate a manner as possible, the

Sultan's attention to the fact that the principal outrages now complained of were alleged to have taken place at Mush, formerly in the Vilayet of Van, and now in that of Bitlis, which is a considerable way from the Persian frontier, I naïvely asked, "Does Musa Bey, the Kurdish Chief, belong to that particular sect?" (Musa Bey is a Kurdish Chief who is accused of having committed dreadful outrages on Armenians at Mush.)

His Majesty at once replied that Musa Bey was not of that sect, and that he had heard of the charges brought against him, which were denied by the Bey, who had even expressed his willingness to come to Constantinople to undergo trial here; and His Majesty hoped this would be the case, adding that if further information about him were required he would let me have it through his First Secretary.

I thanked His Majesty for this, and mentioned the difficulties I experienced in obtaining correct and accurate information from those distant districts, especially when no British Consul resided in the locality supposed to have been the scene of particular outrages, and that, to my great regret, I had frequently felt unable to supply Her Majesty's Government with reliable information as to the alleged facts on that account.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

No. 36.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received May 31.*)

(No. 190.)
My Lord, *Constantinople, May 24, 1889.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 150 of the 16th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a despatch from Her Majesty's Consul at Jerusalem reporting the appointment of the Vali, Raouf Pasha, to be Governor-General of Beyrout, and the nomination in his place of Rashad Pasha, late Governor of Serres.

I have ascertained the following respecting Rashad Pasha's antecedents. In 1864 he was first employed at the Sublime Porte, and in 1866 was attached to the Legislative Section of the Council of the Empire (now abolished). In 1872 he was appointed Sub-Governor of the Caza of Biledjik. In 1874 he entered the Municipality of Pera in the capacity of Chief Secretary. In 1875 he was appointed Sub-Governor of Mersina, and in 1878 promoted to be Mutessarif of the Sandjak of Pias, but was in the same year transferred to Cozan. In 1882 he was appointed Governor of Amassia, and then he went in the same capacity to Djanik, Yuzgat, and Serviche, which post he now leaves.

His Excellency has never served in Ottoman Embassies abroad, but in 1867 he left Turkey and resided some time in Europe as a political refugee, as he belonged to the party known as the "Jeune Turquie."

His Excellency has also been connected with the press. He is said to be an accomplished gentleman, with enlightened ideas, and to be an able and intelligent official.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 36.

Consul Moore to Sir W. White.

Sir, *Jerusalem, May 6, 1889.*

I HAVE the honour to report that Raouf Pasha, Governor of Jerusalem, has been transferred to Beyrout as Governor-General, after an administration extending over thirteen years.

During the whole of that period our mutual relations have been of the most friendly character; in Raouf Pasha Jerusalem loses a just, liberal-minded, and enlightened Governor.

His successor is Rashad Pasha, late Governor of Serres, of whom very little is known here. He is said to have served in more than one Ottoman Embassy in Europe.

I have, &c.
(Signed) NOEL TEMPLE MOORE.

No. 37.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received May* 31.)

(No. 192.)
My Lord, *Constantinople, May 25*, 1889.

SINCE the reported atrocities at Moosh reached me by means of extracts from various foreign journals, I have been at great pains to discover the accuracy of these allegations, which were denied at the Porte, and upon which, notwithstanding all my repeated efforts, I am quite unable to give your Lordship any reliable information with the exception of a précis drawn up by Mr. A. Hardinge of that given to Sir Alfred Sandison and Mr. Marinitch, with reference to the complaints of a deputation from Moosh on the subject.

I have even complained to His Majesty the Sultan of my inability to comply with my duties on this point, as your Lordship will no doubt observe from a passage of the despatch No. 183 of the 20th instant, which I had the honour of addressing to you.

In this matter, therefore, I was glad to observe that the Earl of Carnarvon gave me due credit for my sincere desire to ascertain the nature of the actual facts, but, unfortunately, I have found myself unable to carry out my earnest wish, and to follow in the footsteps of my predecessors in this respect.

A couple of days ago I asked Colonel Trotter to see some of the American missionaries here, thinking that they might have received intelligence from which I could draw reliable data.

The only thing which the Rev. Mr. Dwight, of the American Mission, showed Colonel Trotter, was news from the Nestorian country, but most of it refers to what took place last year.

It seems, however, that these missionaries are afraid that the disturbances of that period will break out afresh during the present summer.

I cannot, of course, say whether there is any foundation for these apprehensions, but the Nestorians as well as the Armenians in a portion of those districts appear to be in constant fear of Kurdish outbreaks; and these gentlemen have information bearing out the accounts of the insecurity prevailing in portions of the Vilayets of Van and Hekkiari.

Under these circumstances, I would venture to suggest that Colonel Chermside should be instructed to visit some of those districts and report what comes under his observation.

Her Majesty's Consul at Erzeroum is particularly well-fitted by his intellect, experience, and tact for so delicate an inquiry, and I am sure that, even if he were not able to collect any new data, the very fact of a visit from him and the interest just displayed by Her Majesty's Government would be conducive to much good in those disturbed districts.

Should your Lordship authorize me, by telegraph, to instruct Colonel Chermside accordingly, there would be some advantage in his commencing this tour before the hot season begins.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 37.

Memorandum.

MR. MARINITCH reports that on Wednesday the 2nd instant, when the Council of the Armenian Gregorian community held its usual sitting under the presidency of the Patriarch at Koum-Kapou, a large crowd assembled outside the churchyard, consisting of a deputation from Moosh (Vilayet of Diarbekir), and of most of the Constantinople Armenians originally from that place, who had come to complain of outrages committed by Moussa Bey, an influential local Kurdish Chief. The Patriarch having called some of them before him, they stated that Moussa Bey had been imprisoned on a charge of oppressing the Armenians, but had managed to escape, and, in revenge, had collected his Kurdish followers and fallen upon the Armenian villagers, plundering houses, violating girls, and torturing and murdering the population, some of whom he had burned alive after pouring petroleum over them.

Whilst these statements were being made to the Patriarch, a telegram was handed to him confirming them, from the inhabitants of Moosh. It had come by the post, its

senders having been afraid to entrust it to the telegraph office. The Patriarch endeavoured to calm the people, and decided to report the matter to the Grand Vizier, with a view to obtaining redress, and, at the same time, to send two or three of the deputation to his Highness for reference in case of necessity. They were followed to the Vizirate by the greater part of the crowd, which was, however, dispersed by the police without resistance. The Minister of Police is said to have reported fully to the Sultan on the incident, which, it is asserted, has created a certain impression at the Palace, and has led to the secret dispatch of some officials to the spot to make inquiries.

Sir A. Sandison inquired of the Grand Vizier on the 9th instant as to the so-called "Armenian demonstration." His Highness admitted that a deputation of some seventy or eighty persons had appeared at his Department, but he professed himself unable to understand the real meaning of their proceedings. It was, however, apparently to complain of certain murders of Armenians at Moosh, laid to the charge of Moussa Bey of that place. He added that he did not see how a crime committed at Moosh could affect the Armenians at Van, Ismid, and Constantinople, who had joined the deputation, the real object of which, in his view, was to create a sensation, and afford subject matter for the foreign press.

Constantinople, May 13, 1889.

No. 38.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received May* 31.)

(No. 193. Confidential.)
My Lord, *Constantinople, May 26*, 1889.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 192 of yesterday's date, I have received a telegram dated Trebizond, the 24th May, a copy of the decypher of which I have the honour to inclose, and which I had the honour to repeat to your Lordship.

From its contents your Lordship will I am sure learn with regret that even the Turkish military authorities give Her Majesty's Consul a distressing account of the condition of insecurity in the Van and Bitlis Vilayets.

I shall endeavour to make any use I properly can of this information immediately after the Ramazan fast, and the Bairam feast which follows it, are over, which will be in another week's time, or even earlier should a favourable opportunity present itself.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 38.

Colonel Chermside to Sir W. White.

(Telegraphic.) *Trebizond, May 24*, 1889.

YOUR telegram of 15th.

I am forwarding a despatch concerning Kurd Chief mentioned. Up to 7th May his retainers held roads near Mush, and he had not been arrested. I have heard of three serious outrages by him or by his followers during past two months, including the murder by fire of Lha of Arkavanan, near Mush.

Military authorities confidentially mentioned that the state of the Van and the Bitlis Vilayets most dangerous (?) owing to bad administration of the Governors, and they suggested representation to the Porte by your Excellency.

No. 39.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received May* 31.)

(No. 194. Confidential.)
My Lord, *Constantinople, May 27*, 1889.

WITH reference to your Lordship's despatch No. 87 of the 18th March, authorizing Colonel Chermside to undertake certain journeys with a view to collect military and other information, I have the honour to submit herewith a copy of a despatch I have

now received from Colonel Chermside, inquiring as to whether he should visit the district of the Nestorian Christians.

In my despatch No. 192 of the 25th instant, I suggested that it would perhaps be advisable that Colonel Chermside should be sent to make inquiries into the reported outrages on Armenians, and it is in connection with this proposal that I venture to submit the present despatch for your Lordship's consideration, and hesitate to reply to Colonel Chermside before receiving your Lordship's instructions.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 39.

Consul Chermside to Sir W. White.

(Confidential.)
Sir, *Erzeroum, May* 11, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to inform your Excellency that I propose, in accordance with your telegraphic authority of the 24th March, to proceed to Van in June.

I am inclined to think it will be well to meet Mr. Devey there, should there be no reason to bring him to Erzeroum; should my travels be prolonged much beyond Van, he might then proceed to Erzeroum.

I write this despatch with reference to your Excellency's telegram of the 17th December, 1888, re the Nestorian Christians, and my letter of the 9th January in reply. I would be glad to know your Excellency's wishes on the subject, and whether you wish the district visited or not.

My principal object, personally, in visiting it, would be topographical, and having Colonel Bell's Report, and having also myself traversed the district, I am quite aware as to what points of interest further information is desirable.

As to the expediency, politically, of visiting the district, I am more doubtful, and, therefore, am anxious for your Excellency's instructions or views.

I do not myself see how political protection, that can be of much use, can be extended to these people; and the Turkish authorities are very jealous of foreigners going among them, as well as among the neighbouring Kurdish tribes.

The visit of a Consul may tend to raise expectations which cannot be realized, as to non-payment of taxes, tribal privileges, and so on.

I do not sympathize with their pretensions to maintain ancient privileges, and not to pay taxes, though I fully admit how far more heavy is the incidence of the general and identical taxes of the Empire on poor mountain communities than on the inhabitants of such localities as the rich western littoral of Anatolia. The most that, I think, could be demanded of the Porte would be, that they should retain their arms; and that, as was done last year, prompt action should be taken against outrages on them by their Kurdish neighbours. On the other hand, owing to the interest taken in the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission, and the presence in the district of Anglican clergymen, it may be as well, for the sake of information, that the Consul for Kurdistan should visit the locality.

In this case it might perhaps be as well, both for the purpose of seeing the heads of the Mission, and also as less likely to cause difficulty with the Turkish authorities, that I should proceed from Van to Urumi, and thence back to Van or Bitlis.

I have, &c.
(Signed) HERBERT CHERMSIDE.

No. 40.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received June 2, 6·50 P.M.)

(No. 28.)
(Telegraphic.) *Constantinople, June* 2, 1889, 5·35 P.M.

YOUR Lordship's telegram No. 31: Mussa Bey.

In reply to representations made by me at the Porte, in compliance with your Lordship's above instructions, I have received a reply which is as follows:—

"Sole official information Moussa Bey is on his way to Constantinople.

"He passed Bitlis on his way to Constantinople, and he is ready to answer all charges against him.

"Moussa Bey is accompanied by officials of the Vilayet of Bitlis."

No. 41.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received by telegraph, June 2.)

(No. 201. Ext. 28.)
My Lord, *Constantinople, June* 2, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to report that, in compliance with the instructions contained in your Lordship's telegram No. 31 of the 29th ultimo, I made representations at the Sublime Porte on the subject of the atrocities of which Moussa Bey was accused.

The reply given me was as follows:—

"According to official information, Moussa Bey is on his way to Constantinople. He passed through Bitlis on his way here.

"On his arrival at Constantinople he is ready to answer all the charges brought against him. He is accompanied by officials of the Vilayet of Bitlis."

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

No. 42.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received June 4.)

(No. 197. Secret.)
My Lord, *Constantinople, May* 30, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Lordship the copy of a despatch received by me from Trebizond from Colonel Chermside, and inclosing one he received from Her Majesty's Vice-Consul at Van from Bitlis, giving an account of Moussa Bey and of his outrages.

I have likewise the honour to inclose a copy of the figures I have just received from Colonel Chermside from Trebizond on the same subject.

I shall not fail to act on your Lordship's telegraphic instruction of yesterday's date No. 31.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 42.

Consul Chermside to Sir W. White.

(Confidential.)
Sir, *Trebizond, May* 24, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Excellency, in confirmation of my telegram of this day's date, two copies of a despatch by Mr. Devey, which, though dated Bitlis, 27th April, only reached Erzeroum on the 18th May, and were received by me here on the 23rd. Mr. Devey has recently visited Bitlis with my sanction, but at his own expense. I have also received news from Mr. Cole, of Bitlis, and from other sources, relative to the doings of Moussa Bey.

Since the occurrences mentioned in Mr. Devey's despatch, news has been received of Moussa Bey's having killed two men at Akhlat, on Lake Van. In his despatch Mr. Devey states Ohannes of Akhavank to have been killed at Moussa Bey's instigation; but according to the information which reached me direct he was killed by Moussa Bey with his own hand under circumstances of atrocious cruelty, and it was this which led to the Government deciding to make the arrest from which he at once escaped. I have also been informed by travellers that Moussa Bey's Kurds hold all the roads near Mush, and that traffic has consequently to make a considerable détour.

The Vilayets of Van and Bitlis are in a very unsatisfactory state as regards the impunity which outrages and crime enjoy, and the supineness, apathy, or culpable negligence of the Governors.

The military authorities are by no means satisfied with the civil administration of

the Kurdish provinces, and Turkish officers of very high rank have spoken to me on this subject.

It will, I think, interest your Excellency to know that the Lieutenant-General Moussa Pasha mentioned to me the lamentable state of lawlessness of the Van and Bitlis Vilayets, pointing out how it reflected on the Government, and what a reasonable pretext it furnished to the enemies of the Ottoman Empire for well-founded accusations. The military authorities, of course, only take action in support of the Civil Administration by special order. Moussa Pasha expressed himself very strongly as to the shortcoming of the Governors, and suggested representations to the Porte by your Excellency.

Such an opinion on the part of a high Turkish official confirms in a significant manner the current reports as to the state of the administration in these provinces.

I have, &c.
(Signed) HERBERT CHERMSIDE.

Inclosure 2 in No. 42.

Vice-Consul Devey to Consul Chermside.

(Confidential.)
Bitlis, April 27, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to acquaint you of the escape while under arrest of Moussa Bey, of Khuit, which took place four weeks ago.

Moussa Bey is about 30 years of age, the son of Mirza Bey, who was killed in a Kurdish feud at Bulanyk four years ago; one of Mirza Bey's wives was the sister of Bahri Pasha, Mutessarif of Pera, at the capital; the "Ijra Memur" of Bitlis Vilayet is also a cousin of Moussa Bey. Born at Khevian, a village near Mush town,* beyond the Caza of Khuit, his rule is absolute over five or six large Kurdish villages of Khuit, and he is able to do much as he likes both there and in the Mush Plain between Bitlis and Mush; it is said nearly 1,000 armed men are under his orders, and 110 at present hold the roads, and are preventing the villagers from taking their corn to be ground at the mills and from moving about. It was Moussa Bey who wounded two American missionaries in May 1883.

His escape has greatly troubled the local authorities. The Tabur Aghassi, who was responsible for his detention, was put in prison, and is now under interrogation, and it may bring about the dismissal of the Vali.

Moussa Bey, it appears, had been continuing a career of violence, and had committed divers actions of oppression and lawlessness for several years past. The villagers of the Mush Plain appealed for redress to the local authorities, and, finally, to Constantinople, but could obtain no satisfaction. Of late only their complaints were taken into consideration, and orders were issued from the capital for inquiry. But Moussa Bey enjoys great influence in this town, and is a close friend of the Sheikhs Haji Nejmeddin Effendi, of the Idaré Council, Yusuf Agha, and other prominent members of the Government, and the orders were put aside. Further, Moussa Bey was residing all the winter in the town, and had not of late been committing excesses, nor did any one venture to bring any charge against him for past misdoings; on the contrary, he had rendered valuable service to the Government in buying the tithes of Khuit for £T. 500, and collecting them himself to his own advantage, whereas the Government would have been able to do very little if left to their own resources. During the winter Mehemet Ali, Mutessarif of Mush, was making various efforts to bring Moussa Bey to justice; soldiers were even sent to arrest him, but perhaps their behaviour was not very exemplary. The conduct of the Mutessarif is variously interpreted; it has been affirmed that he was persecuting Moussa in order to extract a bribe from him, but I am inclined to believe he is an honest man, and was really striving to keep order and administer justly. Moussa Bey was angered at the Mush Christians for the complaints they were forwarding against him, which possibly were not entirely true; a certain Ohan of Akhavank village, resident at Mush, had taken a prominent part in forwarding these complaints; having occasion to come to Bitlis about six weeks ago, Ohan carefully kept his intention secret, but Moussa, however, learnt his presence here, and placed four or five men on the road near this city, who captured him, though fleeing by night to escape observation; they took him to Gotni, a Kurdish village on the Mush road, and there put him to death by fire, under circumstances of appalling torture. Hereupon a fresh order was received from Constantinople for Moussa's arest and exile; the Government then attempted to carry

* *Vide* Mr. Eyres to Colonel Everett, August 16, 1883.

this out, but Moussa Bey promptly made his escape from the Tabur Aghassi's house and the midst of the zaptiehs, saying that the local authorities were not acting honestly and openly by him. He went at once to the village of Hartz, where he plundered the house of a certain Mouro, absent at Mush, abducted a young daughter of his, and slew her grandfather. He was then said to be threatening to pillage the post if the sum of £T. 700 he had given as bribes to the authorities was not returned. He has just written a letter to the authorities expressing his willingness to return to reside at Bitlis under guarantee (from them), and maintaining that he is innocent of crime, and that, as was seen here, no one had any suit to bring before the Law Courts.

Some members of the Local Government and others now blame the Vali for attempting to arrest Moussa forcibly and openly, and say he should have been persuaded to withdraw voluntarily to Constantinople, as though by the Sultan's desire, and that this would still be the best course to adopt, and is practicable. The Government is indeed miserably feeble at the moment; the vilayet force of zaptiehs consists of 520 (200 are horse), but Moussa Bey would smile at the futility of any attempt on their part to seize him.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

Inclosure 3 in No. 42.

Consul Chermside to Sir W. White.

(Telegraphic.)
Trebizond, May 30, 1889.

I HEAR on reliable authority that Moussa Bey appeared in streets of Bitlis from the 14th to the 20th May unmolested by authorities, by whom he is even reported to have been well received.

No. 43.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.

(No. 32.)
(Telegraphic.)
Foreign Office, June 4, 1889, 2·15 P.M.

YOUR despatches Nos. 192 and 194 of 25th and 27th May.

Send Chermside as suggested in your No. 192, but he should not go to Nestorians, and the chief object of his journey should be collection of military information.

No. 44.

E *Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.*—(*Received June* 6.)

(No. 199.)
My Lord,
Constantinople, June 2, 1889.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 197 of the 30th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a despatch, and its inclosures, which reached me this morning from Her Majesty's Vice-Consul at Van, on the subject of the outrages recently committed by Moussa Bey.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 44.

Vice-Consul Devey to Sir W. White.

Sir,
Van, May 21, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith, with the object of saving time, one copy of a despatch I have addressed to Colonel Chermside on the subject of the outrages recently committed by Moussa Bey, together with the copy of a Circular letter written by the Rev. Mr. Knapp, of Bitlis, which, though Mr. Knapp's information is derived from entirely different sources to mine, corroborates much of what I had reported, both in my letter of the 27th ultimo and in that of the 18th instant.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

Inclosure 2 in No. 44.

Circular.

Dear Brethren of the Mission, *Bitlis, Turkey, May 7, 1889.*

I WILL take advantage of the hektograph to give you all a brief account of the disturbance that has occurred within this Pashalic, and is daily happening, by the tacit approval of our Pasha, on the part of the bloodthirsty Kurd, Moussa Bey. This I do to aid you in your journey to the annual meeting to be held in Erzeroum on the 17th proximo. I must omit details.

Moussa Bey, a young man of 30, but old in iniquity, spent this last winter as a guest of one of our Kurdish Sheikhs; it happened that an Armenian Headman of Arkavan, eleven hours from here, on Mush Plain, came on business to this city; Moussa had a grudge against him because he had signed a Petition to have the Bey arrested; the latter went in pursuit in the night and found his victim in lodgings and asleep, eight hours from here. First he ignited powder he had poured into the right hand and one of the pockets—the one used to sign said Petition, and the other in which he had conveyed it. Afterwards he stabbed him and threw him on a bonfire which he had ordered made. To bystanding Kurd, on remonstrance with him at inflicting such cruelty, he replied, "Let me not hear a word from you, or I will treat you in the same manner." The Pasha summoned the Bey on his return to the city, but allowed him to make his escape to his village on Mush Plain. This was during the first week of last month, since which he has created terror by robbing caravans, and murdering those against whom he had a grudge, or the wealthy for their money. Week before last a cotton caravan, of some fifty animals and twenty men, were passing on their way from Karpoot to this city. Two of them, natives of the village of Tehme, were singled out, taken to the Bey's village, and stripped of their clothing; but as they proved not to belong to this Pashalic, their clothing was restored to them. These men came and told us their story. Within four days past a caravan, on their way from Aleppo, viz., Karpoot, with goods for Van, while passing through our Mush Plain, were attacked; seven animals, with their goods, were seized, and three men, some say six, were killed.

Mihran writes us from Mush, on the 3rd instant: an Armenian and son were plundered near the village of Darpan; in a village near Horhannes Monastery two men have been murdered. When Moussa Bey was asked why such proceedings were allowed, he replied that the Mutessarif of Mush had robbed them, the Kurds, of 1,200 animals, and they were determined to murder an Armenian for every animal taken, that Moussa Bey affirms that he has given our Pasha from £T. 800 to £T. 1,000 bribe, and that he will requite himself by plundering tenfold that sum from the Christians, &c. The Bey with thirty-five horsemen fell upon Bastavank and killed its Reis, or Headman, and also his father, and such cruelty was exhibited that two lads, grandchildren of the latter, died from fright on the spot.

This was on the night of the 27th ultimo. Threats of similar treatment were sent to other places in that (Aklate) province, and Mr. Cole writes us on the 13th ultimo from Purkhus [*sic*], where he lodged, that the night was rendered hideous from the screams of the villagers who were warding off attacks upon their threatened village, which is one hour from Bastavank. By reason of this threat a few are fleeing to this city for protection: a Petition by 150 Armenian signers here was prepared last Saturday, and, at an expense of 500 piastres, sent by telegraph to the Sublime Porte, begging for protection. But it is the opinion of the more knowing that such a Petition will never reach the Porte, and if it does will prove of no avail. They first applied to us missionaries for our signature, but we refused to become a party to it, having already had sufficient experience with Moussa Bey. Brother Cole and family left us for Am. [*sic*; ? America] on the 29th ultimo. We have heard from them at Gopé, three days out.

Probably I shall write to you each week, for a season.

I am suffering from a severe catarrh cough, as was also Mr. Cole when he left us.

Fraternally yours,
(Signed) GEORGE C. KNAPP.

Inclosure 3 in No. 44.

Vice-Consul Devey to Colonel Chermside.

(Confidential.)

Sir, *Van, May 18, 1889.*

WITH reference to my letter of the 27th ultimo, I regret to have to draw your further attention to the very dangerous condition obtaining in the Mush Plain, consequent on the escape of Moussa Bey.

Outrages of the gravest nature are being daily perpetrated with impunity, nor am I aware that any steps have been taken by the authorities to re-establish public security.

News from Mush only filters through to Van, and it is possible that some of Moussa Bey's crimes may be reported in exaggerated terms here; but it is certain that more than one Van merchant has suffered very heavy loss from caravans being plundered on the Mush-Bitlis road, and I am told that on one occasion some lives were lost. An Aleppo caravan of Aleppo people was also plundered, but the things stolen were restored on the grounds that Moussa Bey had no spite against strangers. Moussa Bey frequently commands these forays in person, and I believe that he personally applied the fiery tortures by which the man Ohan was so cruelly put to death. His Kurds are said to dress themselves as women, and, approaching unprotected groups of village women when in the open country, to seize and violate them. Lastly, Moussa Bey is levying blackmail on the neighbouring villages of from £T. 20 to £T. 50 apiece in a lump sum. In one village, of Akhlat, where his demand met with a refusal, the Kiaya and another man were killed on the following day. The state of alarm is said to be so great that the villagers in some parts leave their houses, and hide from sunset to sunrise.

It is true that Moussa Bey has served his Government in various ways, and was for a considerable time Mudir of Khait Nahiyyé, and this even after proven crimes had been condoned; at the time he seemed to have reformed. But his late defiance of the Government, not to say open revolt, and his "Khunkyar"-like disposal of the property, lives, and honour of the Mush Armenians are matters that cannot be overlooked, least of all in Bitlis Vilayet, where Moslem fanaticism in every quarter has recently taken fresh root; and I venture to think that no measure of exile (which would probably be rescinded in a couple of years), but that some signal retribution, such as hanging Moussa Bey before his own door, should he not perish by the sword, would alone suffice to remind the Kurds of Bitlis Vilayet generally that there is a Government, and that robbery and murder of His Majesty the Sultan's Christian subjects are crimes, and are treated as such.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

P.S. *May* 19.—I learn that a Sheikh of Bitlis (probably Sheikh Emin) and Haji Nejmeddin Effendi personally induced Moussa Bey to return to Bitlis, where he was received with honour, and lodged as a guest in the Sheikh's house. It is added that, by Imperial Iradé, Moussa Bey and his family will reside within, and not leave the limits of Bitlis city.

G. P. D.

No. 45.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received June 14.)

(No. 202.)

My Lord, *Constantinople, June 2, 1889.*

IN my despatch No. 183 of the 20th ultimo I had the honour to report to your Lordship the manner in which I brought the conversation with the Sultan to Moussa Bey in the audience I had of His Imperial Majesty on the previous evening.

I have since been careful to forward to your Lordship every information that I could collect on the subject, and I have also not failed to take advantage of what the Sultan had said to me by sending Sir A. Sandison to Sureya Pasha, His Majesty's First Secretary, and I beg to inclose a copy of the statement made by his Excellency to Sir A. Sandison.

Your Lordship will thus perceive that I have not lost any opportunity in making

representations to the Sultan in the form I thought most conducive to obtain a result corresponding to your wishes in this matter.

I am assured that Moussa Bey will come here in due course, and, until the expectation is either confirmed or disappointed, nothing else can be done.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 45.

Memorandum by Sir A. Sandison.

(Confidential.)

I HAVE the honour to report that I did not fail to speak to Sureya Pasha this afternoon, in the sense of your Excellency's instruction of to-day, in reference to Moussa Bey and the disturbed condition of the Asiatic provinces inhabited by the Armenians.

With regard to Moussa Bey, his Excellency replied much in the same sense as the Grand Vizier, viz., that there are facts and circumstances (which he would willingly communicate for your Excellency's information after the Bairam) which, in his opinion, clearly establish the innocence of Moussa Bey in regard to the crimes and atrocities laid to his charge. His Excellency continued the conversation by stating that he was not personally acquainted with Moussa Bey, but that he had been able to gather from the correspondence which has been going on between the Palace and the Valis of the said provinces that Moussa Bey, who appears to be a very rich and considerably influential "Turk" throughout the country, has got more enemies than friends, who seek by every means to attribute to his initiation and instigation every act of murder committed in the country.

After having been so far the apologist of Moussa Bey, Sureya Pasha went on to say that his enemies having made things too hot for him, he had to leave, or rather abscond from, his native province, but that, according to the correspondence, he could not be precisely looked upon as a disaffected or disloyal subject. This, he added, is sufficiently proved by Moussa Bey's recent conduct in the very instance in which he was accused of the murders at Moush. According to Sureya Pasha, it appeared that the Sultan, on hearing of them, got highly vexed and irritated, and gave orders that he should at once be followed by troops, and delivered to the Imperial authorities dead or alive. As, however, Sureya Pasha added, there appeared to be much exaggeration connected with the crimes or atrocities he was accused of, it was submitted to His Imperial Majesty that he should, in the first instance, be summoned in writing to present himself to the provincial authorities, and proceed personally to Constantinople to answer the charges in question. A communication was accordingly made to him to that effect, whereupon he unhesitatingly expressed his readiness to come at once to Constantinople. Sureya Pasha concluded by saying that, according to the Palace information, Moussa Bey had actually started, and that he is positively expected to reach the capital in about ten days.

Pera, May 27, 1889.

No. 46.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received June 14.)

(No. 208.)

Constantinople, June 5, 1889.

My Lord,

IN continuation of my despatches Nos. 197 and 199, I have the honour to transmit herewith copy of a further despatch respecting Armenian affairs from Colonel Chermside, together with its inclosures, two Reports from Mr. Devey on the subjects of the Mutessarif of Hekkiari and of recent phases of Armenian public feeling.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 46.

Consul Chermside to Sir W. White.

(Confidential.)

Trebizond, May 27, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Excellency two copies of a despatch by Mr. Devey, Her Britannic Majesty's Vice-Consul, Van, reporting the transfer of the Mutessarif of Hekkiari to another post. As there seemed great doubt whether many of the allegations against him were not due to the intrigues of the local Kurdish Chiefs, the above is more satisfactory than his dismissal.

I also inclose a copy of a despatch, and its inclosure, on the subject of recent phases of Armenian feeling and affairs in Kurdistan. Mr. Devey having been four years at Erzeroum is well qualified to give such a résumé: the publication in London of an Armenian paper, the "Haïasdan," has set in circulation very inaccurate and misleading statements on Armenian affairs, especially as to the action of the Turkish Government. I accordingly called on Mr. Devey for the Report in question and other information.

The petty harassing persecutions of Armenians in the Van district is a matter of regret. I consider the Armenian population in those districts restless and disaffected, but possessed of a minimum capacity for causing any serious trouble to the Turkish Government. There is no doubt that subsequent to the Berlin Treaty there has been a considerable amount of revolutionary agitation at work: this culminated four or five years ago in an abortive attempt to form Secret Societies similar to those existing in Bulgaria prior to 1877, and to procure arms.

The Van and Erzeroum districts were principally affected by this movement, those of Erzinjian, Kharsant, Malatia, Diarbekir, as far as I have been able to learn, in a very minor degree. At Erzeroum the movement was favoured by the Russian Consul-General.

The movement is not one which could of itself prove dangerous to the Ottoman Government, and the repressive measures have destroyed or prevented any power of organization or cohesion. The innate sentiment of disaffection to the Turkish-Moslem Government will always remain.

I have, &c.
(Signed) H. CHERMSIDE.

Inclosure 2 in No. 46.

Vice-Consul Devey to Consul Chermside.

Van, May 14, 1889.

Sir,

WITH reference to my despatch of the 30th March, I have the honour to state that the Mutessarif of Hekkiari is to exchange posts with Nezié Effendi, Governor of Arghani Maden.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

Inclosure 3 in No. 46.

Vice-Consul Devey to Consul Chermside.

(Confidential.)

Van, April 13, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to offer with great diffidence, for your consideration, some observations on the present condition of the Armenians of Van in particular, and on Turkish views respecting this branch of His Imperial Majesty the Sultan's subjects in general.

The proverb about giving a dog a bad name might be aptly quoted in respect of the Armenians of Van. Having, unfortunately, got into ill-odour with the Government generally (even officers who have never had anything to do with this vilayet have been led to form a too adverse and unjust opinion of them as a set of seditious intriguers), it has apparently been considered necessary to continue these exaggerated notions of their black designs and disloyalty. One or two local functionaries at the same time have not been remiss, and let slip so fine an occasion for the display of their zeal, and whilst devoting their time and energies to the discovery and scotching of Armenian revolutionary plots and Societies, many of which were purely imaginary or misunderstood,

hope for promotion, rewards, and decorations to crown their efforts; such, by the way, was the result of the course pursued by the late Fikri Pasha (*vide* Mr. Barnham's despatch of the 8th July, 1886).

The Van Armenians, though they may be somewhat fanatical about their Church and nationality, are on very fair terms with their Moslem neighbours, who appreciate more justly such doings as the frequent arrests, recent searchings of the Varak Monastery (Yedi-kilissé), the vague accusation that Armenians bought or stole military rifles for insurrectionary purposes (the Martinis in question, I have reason to believe, were dishonestly collected by Persians for use in Persia; it was the time of the Sheikh Obeidullah disturbances; but the Armenians were as a community entirely innocent), the character of their various Societies founded some eight years ago and since suppressed, and similar affairs. Then, again, the local factions serve to complicate the question, and it would be far wiser to leave the Armenians wholly indifferent than to endeavour to induce them to join one party or another. The Armenians, resenting their recent treatment, are at present inclining towards the Temir-Oglou opposition, however much they may fear and hate this family, of whom Major Clayton (despatch of the 3rd August, 1879) remarks that they are said to be the curse of the whole neighbouring country, and he considers among measures for improvement "first and foremost the extinction of the influence of the notorious families above mentioned, which can hardly be attained except by their permanent banishment." Khalil Pasha has made the first move in this direction; but there remains the question, is it altogether well for a Government to rid itself of the trammels of criticism, and of the wholesome check of an opposition, however corrupt and bad that opposition may be.

Ottoman officers in the Administration, and more rarely Moslem inhabitants, may often be heard comparing Armenia with Bulgaria. A cautious regard for the interests of the Armenians restrains the foreigner from observing that a contrast would be more appropriate. The vast difference in origin, language, character, and Church should alone be sufficient to demonstrate the falseness of such comparison. But, it is advanced, the war of 1877 took its rise in the agitation and disturbances which occurred in Bulgaria, and such a condition must never be allowed to obtain again among the Christians of Turkey, and the Armenians have shown premonitory symptoms. Agreed. We will not, however, discuss the mode of treatment of the disease, and suggest that a return to the statesmanlike policy of more than one of the Kiuprili Zadés in winning the affection and sympathy of the Raya subject by conciliation and equal justice would be more efficacious and profitable, whilst measures of repression such as those adopted here are calculated, if indeed, to hide the sore, no less to drive it to rankle inwardly.

To go back to Bulgaria before the war: there Russian money and Agents were actively employed, as there can be no doubt, for sixteen or seventeen years before the war broke out. Among the Van Armenians, Russian intrigue was unknown and unthought of. It was only in the year 1880 that, during a short period, a few Russian Agents were ascertained to be exciting seditious discontent, and perhaps a small amount of money was spent, but nothing of the kind has since been heard of. Meanwhile, the Caucasus Armenians made open demonstrations of sympathy with their downtrodden brethren of Turkey. A Vartabed of Van delivered a revolutionary address at the Arzrouni Hall in Tiflis. Armenian autonomy was unfortunately mentioned; projects of reform were showered on the country; and some advanced the most radical and unjustifiable changes. The self-styled "advanced" party appeared, including a few schoolmasters and others, since exiled, who thought they could leap into the most enlightened civilization as easily as one puts on a brand-new suit of clothes. The arrival of the British and Russian Vice-Consuls was hailed as a guarantee of reforms being at once carried out, and of special protection for the Armenians. The Armenian Russian Vice-Consul travelling about the country left everywhere a smouldering flame of discontent; and Major Clayton's Dragoman was a furious patriot. All this produced among the Moslems, and especially the officials, a much-to-be-deprecated feeling of distrust, which has since been expressed in the discouraging of education, and in making the Armenians feel their absolute dependence on the Government.

After the war and until the spring of 1884, Hassan Pasha was Vali here; Mr. Eyres refers more than once to his system of managing the Armenians, and keeping them well in hand by showing them certain proofs of revolutionary designs which he had found, and threatening to make use of these documents and of the weapon of political banishment if they were disobedient to his wishes. Hassan Pasha was the one Vali who kept entirely aloof from local factions and intrigues; he was generally respected if feared, and is now specially regretted by the Armenians; at all events, during his administration there was not, as at present, the acute phase of hunting out Armenian seditionary movements. Hamdi Pasha succeeded; he is described as having been timid, fanatical, and

weak, and from the date of his arrival identified himself with the Temir-Oglou party; he came with preconceived notions of Armenian rebelliousness, and in every party intrigue or excitement he saw, or chose to see, the commencement of a serious revolt, as in the affair of the elections in 1886, or again, *vide* his opinions as expressed in Mr. Barnham's despatch of the 23rd December, 1886. It was he who had previously established the small local police force, and made a most unhappy selection of officers. He died two years ago, but even by his death bequeathed further trouble to the Armenians, for, their mutual dislike being notorious, a story was some months later trumped up to the effect that they had caused him to be helped out of this world by poison.

Khalil Pasha next arrived as Governor-General of Van in the spring of 1887, and until the late autumn all went well, as he kept religiously out of all party intrigues, and attempted to keep them under. The Armenians were contented and tranquil, but soon after his arrival the Temir Oglous began to complain that the Rayas were unduly favoured and themselves neglected, and showed an inclination to form an active opposition and give trouble. The Vali did not, however, side at once with the rival though much less powerful party, the clique formed by the Dilaver Oglous, Jameshji Zadés, and their partisans, though he may now, perhaps, be open to the charge of having extended to some of them his special protection as a set-off to the Temir-Oglou influence. About this time he would seem to have fallen rather too much under the baneful influence of a military doctor named Aristides and other intriguers of his type; Dr. Aristides had been temporarily employed as doctor of the Municipality, and was maintained in this post by the Vali, though not to the entire satisfaction of the Commandant. At this period also (November 1887) the Armenian question suddenly cropped up again (*vide* Mr. Russell's despatch of the 13th December, 1887); it would seem that Boghos Effendi had intrigued and stirred up the authorities out of hostility to Mgr. Krikoritz, who had superseded him as Murakhass several months earlier.

From this time forward the system of repression and intimidation was reverted to, and has been actively kept up; Armenian individuals or small batches have been constantly arrested and questioned on practically frivolous counts, and a close espionage exists at the Post Office; in the great majority of cases the prisoners have been at once discharged, and no persons have been exiled, though two sentences of banishment for life have been passed, and are now being appealed against; but it is the brutal arbitrariness and the rude severity with which these inquiries are conducted that are most complained of; and with this, if the tale be true, the existence of an extraordinary Court of Inquiry (Tahkikat Commission), formed by order from Constantinople about a year ago, which consisted of the Vali, the Sous-Procureur, the late Juge d'Instruction, the Tabour Aghassi, and one or two police employés, with two Armenian translators, who hold occasional sessions at irregular intervals, presumably for the purpose of discussing measures for crushing out any germs of sedition, the existence of which may still be suspected.

It should not be forgotten, at the same time, that Van is a long way from the capital and difficult of access, and that the Porte has only the reports of its own employés to depend on; thus, much is left to the discretion of the local officials, and with the special powers intrusted to them in respect of the Armenian question, it cannot but be admitted that they are exposed to the temptation of an excessive or arbitrary use of their functions. The Tabour Aghassi has been, and is still, a great offender in this way; but it would seem that he has rendered particular service to the Vali, who persists in remaining blind to his faults, and in describing him as a pattern officer. The recent visit of an impartial Inspector of Justice has produced some salutary reforms in the Judicial Department. One is led to think that the Executive and other Departments might be benefited by such visits if really capable, honest, and independent men could be found for the difficult and delicate work of inspection in a country where intrigue is as the breath of the nostrils. It must be observed that very little reliance can be placed on the constant Mazbatas, by whomsoever signed, that are forwarded from here to the capital.

Major Clayton some years ago spoke of the want of moral ballast, self-reliance, and cohesion he observed among the Armenians, and he deprecated their love of faction and party jealousy and intrigue: little is heard of their cliques now, for all alike fear to fall under the suspicion of the authorities; "young Armenia" has apparently disappeared, and even the Boghosian* and anti-Boghosian parties seem to be extinct. The Vali, however, declares himself to be annoyed at the character of "representative of the

* *Vide* Annex 2.

nation," as it were, arrogated to themselves by some four or five persons, notably, the two members of the Administrative Council: assuredly, if it should be necessary to speak on behalf of the community, after their Bishop and "Millet Bashi," the Murakhass-Vekil, these members have a certain claim to be heard; and I feel convinced that Khalil Pasha, liberal minded as he is, would not advocate the total suppression of the expression of public opinion in any form whatever. Their great lack at present is a man of solid sense and weight; the present Murakhass-Vekil, a Vartabed of Van, is uneducated, unintelligent, and little respected; of the two members the elder has not much character, is unscrupulous and timid, and the younger, though intelligent, is inclined to intrigue. As to recent Bishops, Mgr. Khrimian, who had visited Europe in 1879 for the purpose of promoting the Armenian cause, was here, and was much loved by the people, from 1880 till the spring of 1885, when Boghos Effendi was appointed Head of the Church and Community, but his retrogressive policy culminated in the National Council Election difficulties (July 1886), and he had to make way for Mgr. Krikoritz. The new Bishop (*vide* Mr. Barnham's despatch of the 27th January, 1887) had been for eleven years at Mush, and bore a distinguished reputation, which he maintained during his twenty months' residence at Van, when, feeling he could no longer cope with the situation, he resigned. Since last August, Thaddœus Vartabed has been in charge. It would be well if the Patriarchate could find a fit ecclesiastic as Head of the Church and Community here, a *persona grata* to the Government, active in guarding their temporal interests, and who, whilst convincing the authorities of the real loyalty of his nationalists, would induce them to have done with any silly inclination to pose as victims and martyrs, to be more steady and rational, and not to slip back into the slough of factious intrigue. I may, perhaps, mention incidentally that the proposed secession from Etchmiazin in 1885 partook strongly of the nature of a theatrical demonstration against the unfair nomination of Mgr. Magar as Catholicos by the pressure of Russia, and of a protest against her repressive action in the Caucasus, whilst a hope that Mgr. Khrimian might possibly be recalled to Van may have contributed to the move.

No Armenian question exists in the neighbouring Vilayet of Bitlis, where so-called seditious movements have not sprung up and flourished at all. Their condition is, however, miserable, for since the vilayet was established after the war it has ever been most corrupt, and during the last three years Moslem fanaticism has grown surprisingly; in the country round Kurdish oppression is as bad as ever, and neither effective protection nor justice is available. Though there is no trouble with the police, their sufferings are really pitiable, and if they are not looked upon as seditious by the Government, the utter contempt and neglect they meet with must be felt as a sore burden. Kurdish Sheikhs even hold that the vilayet is "bil istissna" (under exception), *i.e.*, that the Laws and Regulations as in force elsewhere do not apply, and act accordingly.

The Armenian community of the Erzeroum Vilayet is in a degree more civilized than that of Van; there is commerce, more intercourse with the capital and with foreigners, they have larger and better schools, and the Government has been established on a firm basis for some centuries. Here again the Armenian question is little heard of; the insurrectionary movement of the winter 1882-83 was so thoroughly suppressed, and the ignorant peasants (mostly) who had received or signed the objectionable papers were so promptly and severely punished, that courage was not left to breathe a word. Mustapha Pasha acted with a certain amount of dignity, though doubtless he was inclined to over-estimate the danger, and treat it as of the most serious political importance. The prisoners have, I believe all, since been pardoned by the Sultan, and I am not aware that any attempt was made to rake up old charges, or to represent the Armenians in seditious colours. Once only a report was spread, in February 1886, that the Armenians had rifles hidden in their church, but it only led to the calumniators being imprisoned for a short term. Little or nothing was heard of Russian intrigue among the Armenians, though newspapers from the Caucasus were prohibited. The townspeople were left to follow their business in tranquillity, but occasionally crimes and outrages committed in the districts escaped with impunity, or met with shamefully inadequate punishment. No ill-considered action was taken, the result of groundless fears, not to say ridiculous trepidation, such as on more than one occasion disgraced Hamdi Pasha's administration. The one serious matter was the arrest and banishment in 1887 of an Inspector of Schools named Sarian; in this case it would seem that the Government acted rather harshly.

In the interests of the Ottoman Government, I venture to think it very highly desirable that the Armenian question should be speedily terminated, as far as Van is concerned; the Armenians are far from having any disloyal views or sentiments,

as indeed the Vali avows, and the sore feeling created by unmerited suspicion and consequent persecution would die a natural death from want of alimentation, if, while the present strongly repressive policy were abandoned, more was done to divert their minds to the development of material prosperity, if trade were promoted and roads built, if the much-talked-of steamers were placed on the lake, if more attention were paid to forests and mines, while their local Councils might continue in undisturbed enjoyment of their various functions and supervision over church and school matters.

Before concluding, a word ought to be added on the harm done to the Armenians of Turkey by the publication of such papers abroad as "l'Arménie" and the "Haïasdan" and others; the "profession de foi," of the last named is, "revendiquer par les moyens pacifiques et fermes, la prompte réalisation de l'autonomie admistrative et locale," on the lines of an Ambassadorial note addressed to the Porte in 1880, and on the grounds of Turkish misgovernment and Kurdish oppression. The entirely sufficient reasons disposing of Armenian autonomy need not be recapitulated, and the opinion of educated Armenians of these parts of Turkey, honestly speaking, is that autonomy is unnecessary and undesirable. Journals of the "Haiasdan" genus, however, eagerly seize on every instance of wrong, well authenticated or not, hold it up to European execration, and aggravate what little ill-feeling there may be already between Moslem and Christian, and Raya and Government. With their views they cannot, of course, allow that the Porte is even attempting to govern, and its policy they interpret as based on a plan of exterminating the Armenians by employing every method of oppression and injustice, and by encouraging Kurdish brigandage and cruelty.

I have the honour to subjoin a list of political prisoners and exiles of Van, and a few remarks on the career of Archbishop Boghos Effendi.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

Annex 1.

List of Political Prisoners at Van.

1. A Vartabed, named Daniel, of Alexandropol, fairly well educated and brought up by Mgr. Khrimian, lately Abbot of a monastery at Archag, near Van, was, it is said, quite falsely, accused of having preached sedition in a Van church, and suggested burning the barracks, has been in prison without trial more than a year.

2. Arsen Tokmakian, the Vartabed who uttered an inflammatory discourse at the Arzrouni Hall in Tiflis, also is a man of some education, and had a hobby of collecting old manuscripts and histories from monasteries in the neighbourhood.

3. Apkar Dabanian was a schoolmaster at the Bartoghimeos Monastery (St. Bartholomew's), near Bashkaleh; his offence was singing patriotic songs and teaching them to his pupils. He was imprisoned for six or seven months at Bashkaleh and then at Van; he and the Vartabed Arsen were tried together, and condemned in the Court of First Instance to life exile, but they appealed.

4. Karakin Pageshtzian, a young artisan of Van. A letter containing seditious expressions was written him from a friend in Roumania. In prison more than a year.

5. Seven villagers of Allahkeui (3 leagues distant) addressed a Petition to Mgr. Khrimian whilst here, declaring they were suffering from Kurdish oppression, and asking for arms to defend themselves. Have also been in prison a year or more. The letter was signed by thirty-one villagers and also the schoolmaster, who has lately been released.

Annex 2.

List of Armenians exiled or punished summarily.

1. The schoolmaster Portokalian, now editor of "l'Arménie" at Marseilles.
2. Natanian Garabed Effendi (*vide* Mr. Lamb's despatch of the 30th June, 1885), now residing in liberty at Van.
3. Kaljian Sahag Effendi (*vide* Mr. Lamb's despatch of the 29th December, 1885).
4. Natanian Margos Effendi, a young schoolmaster at Mush, exiled in 1886.
5. Terlemezian Magrerditch was banished, it would seem, for having sent a Map of the environs of Van to a comrade in Erzeroum.

6. The three boys mentioned in Mr. Barnham's despatch of the 23rd December, 1886.

7. Khanigian Mugrerditch, sent to Constantinople last year, now released.

8. Mahdessi Aslanian Khatchadour, condemned to imprisonment for life at Erzeroum last year. His father and brother were recently summoned to Erzeroum, but discharged.

9. Aghavenian Krikor, Issakoulian Karekin, Ajemian Mardiros, all of Van, were examined and sentenced at Constantinople last year. The last-named escaped hence to Russia without going to Constantinople.

10 Tashvartanian Haji Vartan and Aghavenian Haji Artin (father of the above Krikor) were banished lately from Constantinople to Van, but are at liberty.

11. Sarian Effendi, exiled to Kastamboul referred to above.

Archbishop Khrimian was recalled from Van by desire of the Porte.

Annex 3.

Career of Archbishop Boghos.

Archbishop Boghos Effendi, now head of the Monastery of Lim, was born in 1820 at the village of Nouravans, near Van. His father was servant in the house of a Turk, and he himself entered in 1838 a corps of irregular (?) troops and went to Constantinople. He is next seen fighting against Mehmet Ali Pasha, and was taken prisoner at Acre. In 1842 or 1843 he returned to Van, became deacon, and was attached to the Monastery of Lim, and later of Anabat. The Head of the Lim Monastery took him to Tiflis on secular business on one occasion, and he also served in the Murakhass-Khané at Van. In 1850 he was deputed, being now a Vartabed, to take charge of the important Monastery of Varak, but two years later he was at the Murakhass-Khané again, and was respected and made much of by the Moslems, and looking forward to succeed Mgr. Gabriel as Murakhass. During the Crimean war, troops, for want of accommodation, were billeted on the Van inhabitants. This was found disagreeable, and it was resolved to subscribe and build a barracks. The local Council, of which Boghos Effendi was a member, distributed the sum to be collected unfairly. This led to further complaint, and the Council declared the people disaffected. Three persons were subsequently banished to Constantinople, but a new Archbishop arrived and arranged matters. In 1856 the then Vartabed Khrimian came to Van, and joined in showing up the dishonesty or unfairness of the Council, and in causing it to be changed; and since then dates Boghos Effendi's hostility to him. Boghos Effendi, however, remained for some years still attached to the Van Murakhass-Khané. Since then it was twice decided (1867 and 1871) to remove him permanently, and on one occasion a Resolution by the Constantinople National Council was passed never to allow him to return. He was appointed, however, in 1873, Head of the Monastery of Lim, and was temporarily called again to the Murakhass-Khané in 1885-86. He is now living quietly at Lim, and seldom comes to the city, where his allies, the Temir-Oglou family, are now out of favour. It is true he is quite uneducated and indifferent to the march of civilization; and in so far as the party of progress was led by Mgr. Khrimian, he showed himself bitterly hostile to it, and contributed not a little in leading the local authorities to view with suspicion his opponent's efforts to elevate the community. He is, however, a strong and energetic character, having little in common with the typical Armenian, is very popular among the Turks, and highly respected by the Kurds, and so long as he busies himself in building churches and tending practically the villagers' spiritual and temporal concerns, removed from town intrigues and troubles, he is doing genuine praiseworthy work both for his community and Government.

No. 47.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received June* 14.)

(No. 213.)

My Lord, *Constantinople, June* 10, 1889.

IN continuation of previous despatches on the subject, I have the honour to transmit herewith copy of a further despatch from Her Majesty's Vice-Consul at Van, inclosing an extract of a letter from Mr. Knapp, an American missionary at Bitlis, on the proceedings of Moussa Bey.

The accompanying copy of an extract of a letter from Mush, communicated by the American Mission here to Colonel Trotter, is of interest when taken in connection with the information supplied by Mr. Devey.

I have instructed Her Majesty's Consul at Trebizond to inform me by telegraph should Moussa Bey pass through that city on his way here. The Grand Vizier informed Mr. Block on Saturday, the 8th instant, that a telegram had been received announcing his arrival at Erzeroum, which he was to leave for Constantinople to-day.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 47.

Vice-Consul Devey to Sir W. White.

Sir, *Van, May* 28, 1889.

WITH reference to previous correspondence respecting Moussa Bey, I have the honour to inclose copy of an extract which may interest you. It would seem that Moussa Bey did not remain long in Bitlis (counting from Mr. Knapp's date of the 14th May), but was allowed to return within a day or two to his village in company with the Vilayet Mektubji, who went apparently in the triple character of guest, hostage, and custodian, for as soon as Bairam (3rd June) is over, the two are to go on to Constantinople. It is perfectly certain that Edhem Pasha, the Vali of Bitlis, is doing everything in his power to make out that Moussa Bey is entirely innocent of crime.

I have, &c.

(Signed) G. P. DEVEY.

Inclosure 2 in No. 47.

The Rev. G. C. Knapp to Vice-Consul Devey.

(Extract.) *Bitlis, May* 9, 1889.

RECENTLY, in lieu of executing an order long since sent by the Porte to seize Moussa Bey dead or alive, our Pasha sent two or three to him, not soldiers, but private citizens, to persuade him to come to the city. Their mission proved unavailing. He replied that he was willing to comply with the commands of the Government, but he did not recognize the wishes of the Pasha as such. "Else why did he allow me to make my escape when I responded to his summons? No," added he, "I will not go to him. Let him and others in the city to whom I have given 1,000*l.* refund it; otherwise I will procure a load of noses and ears from slaughtered Christian victims." It is however reported that he did make a flying visit upon the Pasha night before last. The Kurds in all parts of this region are now giving trouble. In order to plunder those Armenian villages which they suspect will resist by fire-arms they resort to stratagem—*e.g.*, they slaughtered some forty sheep belonging to Popshen, one of our out-stations, 1½ hour from the city, with the expectation that the owners would vacate their village to rescue their property, and thus the village be the more easily plundered. The owners came and entered complaint before our Pasha, who ordered them from his presence, accusing them of falsehood. They attempted the same kind of ruse at Khofrev,* three hours from here, by driving off one of their flocks of sheep, but the inhabitants chose to remain and defend their homes to rescuing their lost property. Our helper writes us

* Khokhrev.—G. P. D.

from our out-station Tookh that the Kurds entered their village with the view of plunder, but they were resisted. Those villages that are so fortunate as to have fire-arms have a nightly armed guard.

May 14.—Magavia, one of our colporteurs, arrived here from Mush 11th instant. He could not come except by paying a medjidieh as blackmail, and by having one of Moussa Bey's confederates as a body-guard all the way. Magavia confirms the report that Moussa Bey has established a cordon between here and Mush consisting of some six stations, at each of which are posted from five to fifty armed men, who swoop down upon and plunder the passing caravans. The result is that the latter have nearly ceased to enter our city from any direction, and business is coming to a standstill. Last Saturday a company plundered Choorhor,* four hours distant, carried off several hundred sheep and some twenty or thirty yoke of oxen, and carried off everything belonging to the three wealthiest families. The inhabitants, on seeing them coming, fled up Mount Nimrud, at whose base the village is located. Usually a sum of money is exacted, and woe to that village if it fails to pay. I have the names of several villages thus to be doomed; one of these has already been deserted by its inhabitants. Between fifteen and twenty armed men endeavoured to enter to plunder St. Kevork (Armenian) Church, a furlong from my house, night before last, but the inmate rang the bell and soon brought the rescuing parishioners. Yesterday the Sheikh who entertains Moussa Bey, accompanied by a large retinue of Turks and Christians, went out two or three hours and escorted into the city in great honour Moussa Bey; and we are told that this Sheikh and the Pasha have forgiven the Bey, and he is to-day promenading our streets. What does all this mean? we ask. In reply we are told it is to secure fees. In fine, we are having about the irregular state of things as existed during the war twelve years ago.

Inclosure 3 in No. 47.

Extract from a Letter communicated by American Missionary to Colonel Trotter.

May 22, 1889.

ON or about the 15th May certain citizens from Bitlis, by request of the Vali, went after Moussa and tried to prevail upon him to come to Bitlis as per the Pasha's desire. His reply was that he should not come for the Pasha as such, for he had taken money of him and let him go; if he wished to arrest him now, why did he let him escape?

If the Government wanted him he was quite ready to go on to Constantinople, not in chains nor by zaptiehs, but as any other traveller, and he had an invitation to come by letter from Baghri Pasha. It was said a strict order from the Porte had come that he be taken dead or alive. On or about the 22nd May he left Bitlis, some said with an officer to go Moush way, and it was reported he was to pass on to Constantinople.

Baghri Pasha is his relative, and, I hear, Governor of Scutari, and likely it is through him he hopes to clear his way. He was said to have sent 800*l.* to Constantinople for use.

---

* A large village near Tadvan known as Chukur or Chalkani.—G. P. D.

No. 47*.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.

(No. 208.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, June 18, 1889.

I HAVE received and laid before the Queen your Excellency's despatch No. 202 of the 2nd instant, reporting the steps you have taken to bring to the Sultan's notice the information which you have received respecting Moussa Bey's proceedings.

Your action in this matter is approved by Her Majesty's Government.

I am, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 48*.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received June* 28, 2·10 P.M.)

(No. 33. Confidential.)

(Telegraphic.)

Constantinople, June 28, 1889, 1·5 P.M.

MR. FITZGERALD, formerly correspondent of the "Standard," has been here, without calling on me, on his way to Armenia, giving out that he is going there for the "Standard" newspaper.

I am afraid that, as regards the suspiciousness of the local authorities, he may get into some trouble, and his presence is sure to excite hopes among the Armenians.

No. 48.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.

E
(No. 216 A.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, June 26, 1889.

THE Turkish Ambassador spoke to me to-day about the rumours which had been in circulation as to atrocities alleged to have taken place in Armenia. He stated very positively that there was no truth whatever, either in the story of the bride who had been boiled, or the man who had been roasted alive; that a murder had taken place in one of the outlying villages, and the authorities were actively engaged in tracing the perpetrator of it; but that beyond this incident, which, however lamentable, could not be said to indicate any special feebleness in the Government, there was no truth in the outrages, the existence of which had been so systematically proclaimed. He proceeded to point out the extent to which this case was analogous to that of Bulgaria twelve years ago, and said that he had no doubt whatever that these legends of atrocities were invented purely from a political aim. It was quite impossible, however, under any circumstances, that Armenia could receive institutions resembling those of Bulgaria, inasmuch as the Christian population was only a minority in the district.

I am, &c.
(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 49.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received June* 28.)

(No. 215.)

My Lord,

Therapia, June 17, 1889.

WHEN I called at the Porte on the 15th instant and saw the Foreign Minister, at his Excellency's own request, he placed in my hands a *pro-memorid*, of which I have the honour to inclose a copy, in which it is attempted to disculpate Moussa Bey and the authorities at Bitlis from the charges brought against them in a manner perfectly contrary to the allegations received from trustworthy sources such as persons residing in the province and Her Majesty's Consular officers.

I am assured that Moussa Bey is on his way to Constantinople, and I do not see that anything further can be done in this matter until we ascertain whether he actually arrives, which many persons still doubt, and what he will attempt to do when here to clear himself of the numerous charges brought against him.

According to telegraphic information received from Mr. Vice-Consul Devey, all political prisoners were released at Van on the 14th June. I have no doubt that this is due to the unofficial representations I have made under your Lordship's directions both at the Palace and at the Sublime Porte, but I am awaiting further details from Van by post.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 49.

Pro-memorid.

LE Gouvernement Impérial a toujours prêté la plus grande attention aux plaintes et publications représentant les Arméniens d'Anatolie et notamment ceux de Van et de Bitlis, comme étant en butte à de mauvais traitements.

Il n'a jamais manqué de les contrôler, et des enquêtes effectuées il est toujours résulté que la plupart de ces assertions n'étaient pas fondées, et que les autres n'avaient trait qu'à des faits de droit commun comme il s'en produit dans tous les pays. Bien que la justice n'ait point failli à son devoir, les Arméniens ont dénoncé dernièrement Moussa Bey comme se livrant à des méfaits et à des actes de cruautés. Ému de ces accusations, Moussa Bey, qui se trouvait à Bitlis même, chef-lieu du vilayet, a voulu y mettre un terme en se retirant dans ses propriétés sises à Khouyoud; l'autorité s'étant opposée à son départ il en fut tellement impressionné qu'il prit la fuite. C'est alors que les nommés Parseh Kazar, le Vicaire Arménien, Père Khorène, et les membres du Conseil

laïque de Bitlis, l'accusèrent d'avoir brûlé vif un Arménien et de s'être rendu coupable de meurtre et de pillage à Moush.

Devant des imputations aussi formelles et ne pouvant plus les supporter, Moussa Bey, pour se justifier de ces calomnies, se livra lui-même à l'autorité en invoquant justice. Or, non seulement rien n'est venu jusqu'à présent prouver que de pareils actes aient été perpétrés, mais en admettant même qu'ils eussent été commis, Moussa Bey ne saurait-il en être soupçonné, attendu qu'au moment ou au dire des plaignants ces faits auraient eu lieu, il n'avait point encore quitté Bitlis. Cela seul suffit à démontrer son innocence. Du reste, Ohannès, qu'on accuse Moussa Bey d'avoir fait brûler au pétrole, a été trouvé mort dans un village. L'assassin est recherché. Quant à la jeune mariée qui aurait été enlevée pendant une noce, violée et jetée ensuite dans une chaudière pour être bouillie, le fait est absolument imaginaire. Il n'y a pas d'exemple que pareilles atrocités aient été commises dans l'Empire. La religion s'opposant à ce qu'un corps animé soit brûlé, les Musulmans se gardent bien de jeter au feu même l'animal le plus nuisible.

Les informations que le Consul d'Angleterre à Van a pu recueillir à Bitlis chez Avédis Effendi, où il a demeuré quatre jours, ne sauraient être considérées comme exactes et véridiques. En effet, Avédis Effendi est un de ceux qui cherchent à introduire et à répandre dans le pays le journal séditieux "Hindjall" paraissant à Londres. Le Vicaire Arménien avec lequel le Consul s'est entretenu chez Avédis Effendi, figure, comme il est dit plus haut, parmi les plaignants. Mais il est à noter que l'un et l'autre ont reconnu que les accusations portées contre Moussa Bey étaient mal fondées et le Vicaire a même avoué que s'il s'était joint aux plaignants c'est parce qu'il y aurait été induit et contraint.

Les autorités Impériales veillent toujours au maintien de l'ordre public, et dans un télégramme adressé à la Sublime Porte, le Père Garabed, Vicaire Arméno-Catholique à Bitlis, rend hommage aux efforts louables déployés dans ce but par les autorités de la province où la sécurité est parfaite, à la grande satisfaction de la population qui, déclare-t-il, jouit de la plus grande tranquillité. Le Vicaire ajoute que les nouvelles contraires sont répandues par quelques individus intéressés à déguiser la vérité et à créer des embarras au pays.

No. 50.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received June* 28.)

(No. 210.)
My Lord, *Therapia, June* 17, 1889.

THE translation of an Armenian Petition emanating from the Vilayet of Van has been circulated here in the officious press for the evident purpose of contradicting the allegations as to the disturbed condition of that province.

The Sultan's First Secretary has sent a copy of that Petition to Sir A. Sandison with a view to its being submitted to me by him, and I have the honour to inclose an English translation of it, omitting the list of signatures, which are too numerous (about 150). I have also the honour to inclose the decypher of a telegram I received from Mr. Vice-Consul Devey, whom I asked to furnish me with his views as to the value and weight to be attached to the above-mentioned Petition.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 50.

Extract from the "Turik" of June 12, 1889.

Petition to His Imperial Majesty the Sultan (copy sent to the "Turik" newspaper).

(Translation.) *Van, (by telegram) May* 27 (*June* 8), 1889.

WE have heard with the greatest regret that certain foreign newspapers have lately been inserting, under the title of "Oppression of Armenia," a number of slanderous and hostile communications, and have been publishing various articles to the effect that the Mussulman Beys and Agas, not being able to find Circassian slaves, are seizing Armenian girls by force and carrying them off to their harems; that the Government is even a participator in this abuse; that, tranquillity being at an end, and the hostility between

the Kurds and the Armenians at its height, the Kurds are always killing the Armenians; that a great number of arrests have taken place in the town of Van, and that the adoption of the necessary measures to put a stop to this state of things is imperative; further, we understand that these publications have given rise to discussions in several councils and assemblies. These publications are entirely without foundation, and no Armenian girl has been carried off by Beys or Agas by force nor with consent. With all the Mussulman inhabitants, and especially with the Kurds, against whom these complaints are laid, we are on a footing of equality as regards the commerce of the country, the rights of personal and landed property, legal and other matters, and no hostility exists between us. We do not rightly understand what is supposed to be the object of the arrests, but we have heard of no injustice or distress in this respect anywhere. The aim of these false announcements is a hostile one, viz., to alienate from Turkey those European Governments and peoples which are friendly to her, and to annihilate the hope and trust of your Armenian servants in the Imperial favour and benevolence. The hope and trust of your Armenian servants rests on the Imperial favour and mercy alone; there is no need of, or recourse to, anybody else. Under your Majesty's shadow our tranquillity is perfect. The Vali of the province, Khalil Bey, is your true, faithful, and upright servant. His zealous efforts for the preservation of tranquillity, and his prompt decision in doing justice if ever he hears of the least wrong, causes all your Armenian servants to call down blessings on your Gracious Majesty's head every day. If only he stays here let all the acts of tyranny enumerated by the papers take place!

We beg your Majesty to accept this humble Petition in the name of all your Armenian servants of the Province of Van as a refutation and denial of these publications, and as an opportunity of reiterating our loyalty to your Majesty.

(Signed)

(N.B.—The signatures fill about a column of the "Turik.")

Inclosure 2 in No. 50.

Vice-Consul Devey to Sir W. White.

(Telegraphic.) *Van, June* 18, 1889.

NO great weight I fear. Four hundred [reported ?] nevertheless [to have ?] signed, but it is said at the instigation of the Vali.

Joy at the release of the prisoners is real and universal.

No. 51.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received June* 28.)

(No. 223. Secret.)
My Lord, *Therapia, June* 21, 1889.

MY attention was called a few days ago to a paragraph which was said to have appeared in London in the "Daily News" of Friday, the 14th June, according to which the Russian Ambassador here had "addressed a note to the Porte calling attention to the condition of Armenia, and asking for the fulfilment of the promises contained in Article LXI of the Treaty of Berlin," &c.; I thereupon instructed Sir A. Sandison to make inquiries at the Sublime Porte as to the truth of this allegation, and was informed, in reply, that there was no foundation for it.

Yesterday afternoon M. de Nélidow called upon me, and as I had just obtained the paragraph in question, which was lying on my table, I took this opportunity of clearing up this matter still further by showing it to his Excellency, and asking whether I would be justified in reporting to your Lordship that no such step had been taken by him.

The Russian Ambassador gave me interesting particulars on the subject, assuring me that he had addressed no note nor anything written on the subject, and, in fact, had had no communications of that nature with the Porte, but he added that the Sultan, as was his wont, had sent to him some one, whom he did not name, asking for his advice and opinion with reference to what was said by Lord Carnarvon and your Lordship in connection with Armenia in the House of Lords.

To this his Excellency told me that he answered to the following effect: That for him there was no political Armenian question; there were occasional complaints of ill-treatment, to which he (like myself) had at times called the Porte's attention, but

that for Turkey there always existed the promises undertaken by her under Article LXI of the Treaty of Berlin, and the necessity of seeing the internal condition of those provinces quiet and tranquil, and their population contented.

His Excellency remarked that his broaching that question was not brought about otherwise than by the Sultan's own initiative, due to His Majesty's desire to ascertain his opinion on the subject, and this explanation appears to me perfectly satisfactory, but throws a curious light on the way in which foreign questions are managed here, without even the knowledge of the Sultan's Ministers, while it leaves still unexplained the fact that any English correspondent should have telegraphed home anything on a subject of so delicate and secret a nature, however inaccurately; but "there is no smoke without fire."

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

No. 52.

M. Hagopian to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received June 28.)*

My Lord Marquis, 25, *Chesilton Road, Fulham, London, June* 27, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to bring under your Lordship's notice a matter which, unless it is officially and unmistakably contradicted by the Sultan's Government, would constitute a case of the most flagrant injustice perpetrated by it against the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire.

It has come to our knowledge that a member of the Armenian deputation, who recently waited on the Grand Vizier at Constantinople to present a Petition on behalf of 500 natives of Moush, temporarily residing in the Turkish capital, praying for the punishment of the notorious Kurdish Chief, Moussa Bey, have been arrested by his orders and will be shortly exiled to Tripoli.

We further learn, on reliable authority, that Moussa Bey is an old delinquent who has been already arrested twice in consequence of his numerous misdeeds and cruelties; that on the occasion of his first arrest, he has, for some unknown reason, been pardoned; that on the second occasion, he has succeeded in evading justice and has since been allowed to remain at large; and that he has powerful friends and supporters at Constantinople.

I need not remind your Lordship that the Armenians have, from time immemorial, exercised the right of petitioning the Sultan or his Ministers, and that, by existing Treaties they have morally and legally acquired the additional right of bringing their grievances before the Signatory Powers, and especially before Her Majesty's Government, by every available means. Under these circumstances, to deny them proper hearing, or to punish them for proferring well-founded complaints, be it against the oppressions perpetrated by lawless individuals and certain classes of the population who harbour and abet them, or against the numerous shortcomings of the prevailing system of administration in Armenia, would belie the professed "earnest desire" of the Ottoman Porte to "govern the Armenians with justice and to maintain order in their country." I cannot help adding here, my Lord Marquis, that the non-execution by the Sublime Porte of the provisions of existing Treaties for the protection and well-being of the Armenians, and its treatment of the numerous cases which we had the honour of specifying in our last year's Memorial to your Lordship as exaggerations and misstatements, has produced an unhappy impression both among the Armenians and in Europe. Moreover, my Lord, whatever excuse the Sultan's Government might bring forward in palliation of its negligence to perform the engagements it has contracted, if the sanctity of Treaties is to be observed, and is not an unmeaning phrase, Turkey cannot be absolved by public opinion for the regrettable state of things which it allows to prevail in Armenia, and for the quasi-hostile attitude, which it unhappily deems it its duty to assume in regard to the Armenian question, and which we, along with all its well-wishers, heartily deplore.

Thanking your Lordship for the kindly expressions of concern and sympathy for our long-suffering ancient people inhabiting Armenia with which you have honoured me on several occasions, and trusting that the matters it has been my duty to lay before your Lordship will receive the careful attention of Her Majesty's Government, I have, &c.
(Signed) G. HAGOPIAN.

---

* Copy sent to Constantinople, July 1.

No. 53.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received July 1.)

(No. 232.)
My Lord, *Therapia, June* 27, 1889.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 215 of the 17th instant, I have the honour to report that the Kurdish Chief Moussa Bey arrived at Constantinople on Monday last, the 24th instant, from Trebizond.

I have also the honour to inclose a copy of a despatch from Her Majesty's Consul at Trebizond, giving some information of interest regarding this man's origin and antecedents.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 53.

Consul Longworth to Sir W. White.

Sir, *Trebizond, June* 20, 1889.

ON the 6th instant I received a cyphered telegram from your Excellency asking me to ascertain and report whether Moussa Bey passes through Trebizond on his way to Constantinople, to which I answered that, though his visit to Constantinople is improbable, I would inform your Excellency should he pass through Trebizond.

On the 18th instant I telegraphed Moussa Bey's arrival here, and I have this day wired his having left by the Greek steamer for Constantinople.

The particulars of this man, as gathered at Trebizond, being of some interest, allow me to give them here as briefly as possible.

Moussa Bey, a handsome man of about 30 years of age, is the son of Mirza Bey, a Kurdish proprietor, who, some thirty-five years ago, revenged the dishonour of an aunt by slaughtering the inhabitants of an Armenian village in the Mush Plain, and who, in punishment for this massacre, was retained in custody at Constantinople, only to escape after ten years' imprisonment to renew his nefarious practices in Kurdistan, where the authorities, failing to recapture him, engaged his services in the pursuit of brigands, in which he was killed some six years ago.

Moussa Bey, suspecting that his father's rival, Nedjameddin Bey, an influential member of the Bitlis Administrative Council, conspired towards bringing about the death of his father, made several attempts on the life of this Notable, who, finding that he successfully evaded all efforts of the Executive, conciliated him by marrying his son to Moussa Bey's daughter, and by getting him named Sub-Governor of Boulanik.

His conduct as such, however, was so outrageous that he was soon dismissed from Government employ, and, as an alternative, took to a predatory life, terrorizing the whole country, Christians and Mussulmans alike, by a series of the most cold-blooded atrocities.

In the early part of last month Ibrahim Bey, the Constantinople Inspector of Justice, was proceeding on his round from Bitlis to Mush, and halting for the night at the midway village of Avzut, he there witnessed the flight of the terror-stricken inhabitants at the approach of Moussa Bey and his band of robbers. He himself, tired out as he was, could not make his escape, and being brought before this notorious character, with great tact and courage prevailed on him to accept an amnesty, and to submit himself entirely to the wishes of the Sultan.

As a consequence, the Porte invited Moussa Bey to Constantinople, where, though he is proceeding in company with the Head of the "Correspondance" of the Bitlis Vilayet, the authorities here, on my suggestion, had him secretly watched in order to prevent any attempt of his at stealthily disappearing from Trebizond.

I have, &c.
(Signed) H. Z. LONGWORTH.

No. 54.

Foreign Office to M. Hagopian.

Foreign Office, July 1, 1889.

Sir,

I AM directed by the Marquis of Salisbury to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th ultimo upon the subject of the alleged arrest at Constantinople of the members of an Armenian deputation.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. V. LISTER.

No. 55.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received July 12.)

(No. 237.)

Therapia, June 28, 1889.

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith a translation from the "Levant Herald" of the 25th instant of a telegram addressed by the Governor-General of Van to the Sublime Porte, giving an account of the discovery on the dead body of one of a band of Armenian brigands, dispersed by zaptiehs in Hakkiari, of revolutionary papers proving the brigands to be political agents whose crimes have for their object the stirring up of disturbances in Armenia.

In the absence of any Consular information on the subject from Van, I have asked Mr. Devey, by telegraph, to report to me anything he can learn with reference to this incident, which has been been brought to my notice not only by the Turkish officious press, but also by orders from His Imperial Majesty the Sultan.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 55.

Extract from the "Eastern Express" of June 25, 1889.

LA SITUATION À VAN.—Le Gouverneur-Général de Van a adressé le télégramme suivant au Gouvernement Impérial :—

"A la nouvelle de l'apparition de huit brigands dans la localité Tchouh, près de Hekkiari, des gendarmes ont été envoyés immédiatement à leur poursuite, et ont réussi à en tuer deux ; les autres ont pris la fuite. Deux zaptiés ont été blessés dans l'engagement. Les brigands tués sont des Arméniens, et des trois fusils qui ont été saisis sur ces derniers et sur un des brigands en fuite, l'un est de la fabrique Martini et les deux autres sont des Berdans. Sur un des brigands tués on a trouvé un carnet contenant des papiers écrits en Arménien qui ont été immédiatement traduits. Parmi ces papiers il y a deux lettres portant les signatures de Avédis Badikian, à Londres, et de Portocalian, à Marseille, et adressées en Septembre à Vehemli Carabet Coulaksizian, du bourg de Heftuhouni, et une pièce portant la signature du dit Carabet Coulaksizian, avec cette annotation en tête : 'Mes dernières notes.' Le carnet porte des notes sur des événements journaliers. Le contenu de ces papiers méritant d'attirer l'attention, je m'empresse de le faire connaître.

"La lettre signée 'Avédis Badikian,' est datée du 25 Avril, 1305, et porte ce qui suit :—

"'J'ai dit que vous avez fait des efforts pour troubler Van, et que vous avez constitué un Comité ; c'est un bon signe. Ne divulguez pas la formation du Comité. Les Hellènes ont pendant sept ans gardé secrète leur Société, et ce n'est qu'après qu'ils se sont mis à l'œuvre. Si vous voulez faire du bien à votre pays, vous devez vous procurer de l'argent et des hommes. Il faut des actes et non des paroles.'

"Dans la lettre de Portocalian portant la date du 27 Avril, 1305, il est dit :—

"'Ayant reçu votre lettre, je l'ai fait publier par le journal Arménien. Donnez des nouvelles de la localité où vous vous trouvez et des localités avoisinantes, et surtout de Van. Nous avons formé ici une Société sous le nom de "Société Patriotique." Trouvez là des membres pour cette Société.'

"Dans la pièce précitée l'auteur, en parlant du temps qu'il a passé les yeux bandés, de la tyrannie des cruels Turcs, du désespoir de ses compatriotes, dit qu'il a fait vœu

No. 54 A.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.

(No. 220.)

Foreign Office, July 1, 1889.

Sir,

I TRANSMIT to your Excellency herewith a copy of a letter from Mr. Hagopian upon the subject of the alleged arrest at Constantinople of the members of an Armenian deputation.[a]

I am, &c.
(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 54 B.

Mr. C. D. Collet to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received July 4.)

7, Coleridge Road, Finsbury Park, London, July 4, 1889.

My Lord,

IN your reply to Lord Carnarvon and the Archbishop of Canterbury last week you made no reference to the defence of the liberality of the Ottoman Government in the reply made to the invitation of the Pope by the Armenian Bishop of Smyrna.

I infer that you have not seen it, and I take the liberty of sending you a copy.

I have, &c.
(Signed) C. D. COLLET.

Inclosure in No. 54 B.

The Armenian Church and the Ottoman Government.

ON the 28th June Lord Carnarvon called the attention of the House of Lords to alleged atrocities in Armenia of which neither he nor the Archbishop of Canterbury, who supported him, indicated the localities, but which it is contended that the British Government ought either to believe and resent, or to categorically disprove.

In the course of his speech the following fell from the lips of the Archbishop :—

"The state of things was such that the Pope had addressed the Armenian Church, through its Patriarch, asking that it should be placed under the Church of Rome. There had never been a nobler answer than that of the Armenian Patriarch to this tempting proposal. He had declined to purchase even an absolute protection at the price of the surrender of his Faith and Church."

We have not hitherto heard of any reply from the Armenian Patriarch. We, however, read in "La Revue de l'Orient" last autumn a reply from the Armenian Bishop of Smyrna.

We are very far from disapproving this reply, but why the proposal should be called tempting we are unable to discover. The Pope certainly has no power to reward a surrender of Armenian ecclesiastical independence by any protection, nor has he either the will or the power to persecute the Armenians for their courteous refusal of his invitation. This cannot be the reply to which the English Primate refers, or he would have given from it the following extract.

After explaining that the Armenian Church is, like that of Rome, of Apostolic foundation, Bishop Melchizedech continues :—

"But you are not the first author of this invitation. It has been made repeatedly in the course of centuries, since the inauspicious day of the schism of the Eastern and Western Churches, the Roman and the Greek. The Armenian Church has preserved its original form, and has ever been unwilling to join this schism, in order not to lose its independence, and to remain the free bride of her affianced Saviour. Certainly invitations to depart from this attitude have not been wanting ; there have even been reproaches, menaces, and persecutions, with the difference that this time it is no longer the Greek Church but Russian policy which oppresses the conscience and the liberty of the Armenian Church. There are, then, two opposite influences which persecute the Armenian Church, which has suffered so much. The Vatican seeks temporal power by the recognition of the Papacy ; Russia, on the other hand, seeks spiritual

[a] No. 52.

dominion by political unity. Both invite us. Russia with her policy has already penetrated into the holy places of the Armenian clergy. You invite us, but Russia says to us, 'Such is my will.'

"But if your means are not the same, the end is identical, that of putting an end if not to the existence, at least to the independence, of the Armenian Church."

To this Bishop Melchizedech adds in a note:—

"The love of truth imposes on us the duty of declaring that the Ottoman Government, far from persecuting us, or from exercising pressure on our religious liberty, has ordered that the men who wish to go over ('se convertir') to Islam should be sent to their Spiritual Chief in order that he might make a last attempt to maintain them in their ancient faith. In my position as Bishop of Smyrna I have been an eye-witness of a great number of such cases."

The Armenian Bishop of Smyrna is not the Armenian Patriarch, but his testimony to the liberality of the Turkish Government is not on that account the less valuable.

---

de se vouer jusqu'au dernier moment de sa vie à la délivrance de sa nation de la misère dans laquelle elle se trouve, et qu'il a décidé avec deux autres jeunes gens de mourir pour cette cause. Les annotations du carnet portent:—

"'Pour l'homme qui vit au dix-neuvième siècle, il n'y a d'autre air à respirer que l'air de la liberté. Laissez-moi souffrir avec mes conationaux. Peut-être suis-je capable de les aider. Toi, je sais que tu as des torrents de larmes.'

"Après ce préambule, l'auteur dit que la nuit du 17 Mai, afin que l'on ne sût pas où ils devaient se rendre et en trompant tout le monde, sans même avoir prévenu leur cher Président, ils sont sortis de Heft et de Van déguisés en Kurdes; ils ont été forcés de marcher pendant la nuit et le matin du 18 ils sont restés dans les vallées, et étant arrivés le même jour à la frontière Turque, il se sont cachés derrière des rochers. L'auteur rend ensuite compte comment ils ont marché jusqu'au jour du 23 Mai, nomme les localités qu'ils ont traversées, les magasins où ils se sont couché et dit que le 24 ils sont arrivés à la localité précitée de Tchouh. Ces annotations sont faites jour par jour en forme de journal.

"On sait qui est Portocalian à Marseille. Quant à Badikian, c'est un intrigant qui, sous prétexte d'exercer son métier de photographe, voyage partout. L'année passée il est allé en Europe; il est originaire de Van. Carabet Coulaksizian est aussi de Van; il a fait ses études dans les écoles des églises d'Érivan, en Russie. Il y a quelques années, il était venu à Van où il a été professeur dans quelques écoles. Ensuite, il s'est rendu à Hoftivan, en Perse, et il a enseigné dans l'école de cette localité. Il était le chef des bandits dont il est parlé plus haut et c'était un des deux tués; c'est sur lui qu'on a trouvé les papiers en question.

"L'agent de police Avédis ayant connu parfaitement le dit Carabet a été expressément envoyé sur les lieux pour faire les constatations nécessaires. Le résultat de ces constatations et des enquêtes sera communiqué ultérieurement.

"L'apparition des brigands Arméniens dans cette région dans le but de dévaliser les voyageurs et de commettre d'autres méfaits n'est pas sans précédent. Il est évident que ceux-ci sont des révolutionnaires qui, au moyen de correspondances échangées avec les Arméniens établis à Londres et dans d'autres villes de l'Europe, se livrent à des crimes politiques afin de susciter des événements et faire à la fin éclater une révolte.

"Le fait que les malfaiteurs ont été détruits peu de jours après qu'ils ont franchi la frontière de l'Empire et non seulement avant qu'ils aient pu mettre leur projet à exécution mais avant même qu'ils aient pu commettre le moindre acte; le fait que Coulaksizian a été tué et que des papiers ont été saisis sur lui constituent un succès de grande importance remporté sous l'égide de Sa Majesté Impériale le Sultan."

(Signé) HALIL, *le Vali de Van.*

Le 8 (20) *Juin*, 1305.

No. 56.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received July* 12.)

(No. 241. Confidential.)

My Lord, *Therapia, July* 1, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith to your Lordship a copy of a despatch addressed by Mr. Devey to Colonel Chermside reporting that on the receipt of the Petition drawn up by a large number of the natives of Van alluded to in my despatch No. 216 of the 17th ultimo, all the Armenians detained on quasi-political grounds were released, including those mentioned in Mr. Devey's despatch No. 9, which was transmitted by me to your Lordship in my despatch No. 208 of the 5th June.

I have no doubt that the action of the Turkish authorities in releasing these prisoners is in a great measure due to the representations which I made to the Sublime Porte on the instructions contained in your Lordship's despatch No. 190 of the 20th May, and is a symptom of a desire on the part of the Sultan to relax the system adopted by the Vali of Van lately with regard to his Armenian subjects.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 56.

Mr. Devey to Consul Chermside.

Van, June 15, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to inform you that about a week ago certain Armenians, who had by some means or other heard that questions had been asked in the British Houses of Parliament respecting reported abuses and outrages committed in Armenia, and that exaggerated accounts of the same had been published in some foreign newspapers, prepared and forwarded to Constantinople two statements signed by about 400 natives of Van, bankers, merchants, members of Courts, &c., of which one was addressed to the Sultan, and the other intended for publication in the "Tarik," to the effect that no such abuses and outrages had occurred in this province, that they were proud and happy to live under Ottoman rule, at present so ably administered by Khalil Pasha, and that they begged leave to assure the Sultan of their perfect devotion and loyalty in spite of anything said or reported that might lead His Majesty to think otherwise.

So far as my information goes, I should judge that the sending of these declarations was by no means an entirely spontaneous movement, nor was it a general expression of the opinions of the Armenian community of Van. The villagers in the neighbourhood are probably not yet aware that any such "mazbata" has been written, and the majority of those who signed may be considered as allies or supporters of a new party that is springing into being under the guidance of Matanian Garabed Effendi, who was exiled with indignity in 1885 by Hamdi Pasha, on being maliciously denounced as a stirrer-up of intrigue by Boghos Effendi; as a matter of fact he is of unscrupulous character, but sharp-witted and energetic.

Whether the sending of these documents were a spontaneous and creditable proceeding or no, it at least has led to satisfactory results, and possibly may be regarded as having afforded the Government a means of honourable retreat from their certainly questionable attitude respecting Armenian politics, as described in my despatch No. 9, for the telegram to the Palace was duly acknowledged, and in the reply signed by the First Secretary, the Vali was requested to convey the thanks of His Majesty the Sultan, and his appreciation of their dutiful and loyal sentiments to a deputation of those who had signed. This was done with due ceremonial at the Government House, and next day, yesterday, all prisoners detained on quasi-political grounds, including without exception those mentioned in Annex I of my despatch No. 9, were released. Hereupon a universal demonstration of thanks was made; Armenians of all classes and parties and ideas hastened to express their gratification, and renew their protestations of loyalty. Terzibashian Artin Effendi, of the Idaré Mediliss, took occasion to make a short extempore speech, and it is said that about 1,000 Armenians asked permission to visit the Vali, either at the Government House or his private residence. A long telegram of thanks is being sent to-day by the whole community, and special prayers for the Sultan are to be offered in the churches. It is said that the Vali is about to request by telegram that the following exiles from Van should be allowed to return to their homes, viz.: the three boys, Odian, Vatanian, and Kaukonian, and also Terlemezian, Muquerditch, Aghavenian Krikor, Iss Akoulian Karekin, and Natanian Margos; the first three are in Konia Vilayet, the second three at Tripoli, and the last at Jerusalem.

It is perhaps not out of place here to remark that the Van Murakhor Vekil lately tendered his resignation, and only continues to remain in office temporarily at the request of the Patriarchate.

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. P. DEVEY.

No. 57.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received July* 12.)

(No. 243.)

My Lord,

Therapia, July 2, 1889.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 232 of the 27th ultimo, I have the honour to inclose herewith a translation of a statement which has appeared in the Turkish newspaper, the "Tarik," stating that Moussa Bey, who recently arrived in Constantinople, has presented a Petition to His Imperial Majesty the Sultan denying all the charges that have been brought against him, and adding that he is fully prepared to answer them in a Court of Justice, and can prove that they are unfounded.

I have at the same time the honour to transmit a copy of a despatch which I have received from Colonel Chermside, inclosing a statement as to an outrage committed by Moussa Bey on American missionaries some years ago, for which no redress was ever obtained.

I caused this document to be communicated to Mr. Solomon Hirsch, the newly-appointed United States' Minister at this Court, with a view to enabling him to take such action on it as he might deem expedient, whilst a favourable opportunity was afforded by the presence of Moussa Bey at the capital, and by the invitation to all persons injured by him to prefer their complaints. Mr. Hirsch, to whom the whole subject was naturally new, and who is himself on the point of leaving for America to bring back his family, appeared unprepared to adopt any immediate decision; but he gave me to understand that he would discuss the matter with the American missionaries here, as being the parties most interested in it, and would be guided by the result of his conference with them.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 57.

Extract from the "Tarik" of July 1, 1889.

(Translation.)

MOUSSA BEY, son of Mirza, of Mush, who has arrived lately in Constantinople, has adressed a Petition to His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, in which he declares that the oppression and brigandage attributed to him by certain persons are without foundation; that on the contrary he has rendered true service to the State in the war and in the offices he has held, and that he has come to the throne of His Majesty to complain of the charges made against him.

Whoever the complainants may be, he is ready to stand with them before the Court and abide judgment, and, while he will willingly accept any punishment which may be pronounced against him, he begs that if slander is proved against the complainants they may be punished according to law. In consequence of this, and as he asserts that the things said about him are pure slander, an Imperial Iradé has been issued instructing the Ministry of Justice to recommend to those concerned that the complainants must bring their charges, whatever they may be, before the competent Tribunal in the regular way, and that if any suit is instituted against Moussa Bey it must be examined and decided with the greatest justice, equity, and dispatch.

This Iradé further provides that the Vilayet of Bitlis shall be instructed that, if there are any persons on the spot who bring forward claims against Moussa Bey, they must at once come to Constantinople, and that, if there are any destitute plaintiffs or if it is necessary to send witnesses, the expenses of the journey shall be advanced provisionally by the Treasury of the Province to be repaid by whoever shall be condemned.

This has been communicated to the Vilayet by telegram from the Grand Vizierate.

Copy of the Petition presented to His Majesty by Moussa Bey:—

"I, your humble servant, am one of those who from their youth up till now has shown fidelity and good service to your Imperial Majesty both in offices and in war, even to the point of risking life.

"A parcel of fabrications have been submitted to your Majesty making me out a brigand and a notorious rascal.

"I, your servant, while purposing to come to your Majesty's throne and submit my case and not to accept any one of these fabrications, immediately on your gracious message set out and came to take refuge in your Majesty's justice.

"Now, whoever has suffered any injustice, wrong, or oppression from your servant, let him come forward; I am ready to appeal to your Imperial justice. I venture, relying on your Majesty's clemency, to pray that, if I am found guilty of these fabricated charges I may be punished, but, if I am found innocent, that the authors of them may be punished for their calumnies and that any right may be made public.

"This, and all other matters depend on the Iradé and Firman of your Majesty.

"Your servant,
(Signed) "MIRZA BEY ZADE MOUSSA BEY."

Inclosure 2 in No. 57.

Consul Chermside to Sir W. White.

Erzeroum, June 20, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour, in confirmation of my telegram, to inform your Excellency that Moussa Bey, of Khuit, conducted by the Chief Secretary of the Bitlis Vilayet, left this city for Trebizond and Constantinople on the 6th June.

I inclose a statement as to an outrage on American missionaries six years ago by Moussa Bey, which formed the subject of a lengthy correspondence between the United States' Minister and the Porte.

I have, &c.
(Signed) HERBERT CHERMSIDE, *Colonel.*

Inclosure 3 in No. 57.

Statement respecting Outrage on American Missionaries in 1883 *by Moussa Bey.*

ON the 31st May, 1883, Rev. G. C. Knapp, and G. C. Raynolds, M.D., Missionaries of the American Board, stationed respectively at Bitlis and Van, were on their way from Mush to Bitlis.

While temporarily separated from their attendants they met three armed Kurds, who set upon them in the most wanton and unprovoked manner, inflicting numerous and severe sword cuts upon Dr. Raynolds, and after robbing them, left them bound and blindfolded among the bushes. A few of the articles taken were returned through the zaptiehs sent by the Government.

Afterwards, Mr. Knapp was confronted, in open Court, with a number of Kurds, and positively identified one of them as the man who inflicted the sword wounds.

This man proved to be Moussa Bey.

This case has been the subject of prolonged diplomatic correspondence between the United States' Minister at Constantinople and the Porte, which continued through at last three years, but no redress was ever secured from the outrage.

As Moussa Bey has just now gone on to Constantinople, and it is most desirable that he should meet his deserts, for the multiplied outrages of which he has been guilty, it seems as if it might be a favourable opportunity renewedly to press the demand for redress in this case, and thereby help forward any efforts made for his punishment in other quarters.

(Signed) G. C. RAYNOLDS.

Erzeroum, June 20, 1889.

No. 58.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received July* 12.)

(No. 247.)

My Lord,

Therapia, July 4, 1889.

MY attention has been called to the following paragraph in a speech made by the Earl of Carnarvon in the House of Lords on the 28th ultimo, speaking on the subject of the reported outrages in Armenia:—

"There was a case which had been cited far and wide, and which, as far as he knew, had not been denied. It was that of a young Armenian, 16 years of age, who was foolish enough to write a patriotic song. He did not publish it, he simply wrote it; but this young man was seized, and committed to one of those prisons where, after a few months, he died. The schoolmaster, too, from whose school this young man had been taken, and who had seen the poem, but had not in any way, as he understood, assisted in making it, was punished, he believed, by being sent into exile."

As this statement is apt to convey an erroneous impression, I venture to state what really took place. The poem complained of was considered by the authorities to be

of a seditious nature, and corrections made therein were found to be in the handwriting of the Armenian teacher in question. The matter was at the time reported at length to your Lordship (see my despatches No. 504 of the 19th December and No. 517 of the 20th December of last year). The sentence eventually passed on the teacher was one of exile for life, and in the early part of this year he was sent here. An application was made to me with a view to obtaining his release, but it not being a matter in which I could in any way interfere officially, I was obliged to limit my action to an officious one with the Grand Vizier, and eventually obtained in the month of May the man's release. I am not certain whether he has yet been allowed to return to his own country.

I did not bring this man's liberation previously to your Lordship's notice as it was obtained quite unofficially by me through the Grand Vizier, whose good sense and kind heart prompted his Highness in the matter, and the delicacy of the subject made me shrink from noticing it in an official correspondence, and thus give the matter publicity.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

No. 59.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received July* 12.)

(No. 255.)

My Lord,

Therapia, July 8, 1889.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 199 of the 2nd ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a despatch from Her Majesty's Consul at Erzeroum respecting outrages in Kurdistan; also a copy of a despatch from Mr. Devey to Colonel Chermside reporting on the disturbed state of the Hekkiari district.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 59.

Consul Chermside to Sir W. White.

Erzeroum, June 26, 1889.

Sir,

WITH reference to the last paragraph of my despatch of the 4th June, I have the honour to inform your Excellency as follows:

With regard to the principal outrage in the Van district which, as reported, consisted of cattle-lifting, &c., Mr. Devey, Her Majesty's Vice-Consul, informs me, that the matter had been much misrepresented and exaggerated by Armenian villagers at the instigation of a Moslem local faction hostile to the Vali.

As regards the outrage by Kurds on Armenians at or near Hani, in the Diarbekir Vilayet, the Vali at once sent gendarmes in force under the Major of Gendarmerie.

The Kurds retired to the mountainous Nerjib district.

The Vali, therefore, applied for permission to use two companies of troops.

An order was at once sent from the Palace to dispatch a whole battalion forthwith.

Very often such dispatch of troops results in nothing, but many of the Turkish officers are very skilful in mountain warfare.

I have, &c.
(Signed) HERBERT CHERMSIDE, *Colonel.*

Inclosure 2 in No. 59.

Mr. Devey to Consul Chermside.

Van, June 18, 1889.

Sir,

A FRESH outbreak of crime is reported in Hekkiari Sandjak.

There have been several instances of petty theft and robbery on the road to Serail and the Persian frontier lately. The road from Van to Bashkaleh is also unsafe: it is said that two Armenians were lately shot near Khoshab by mistake. I will not, however, trouble you with detail, but merely add, that I hear that the road from Bashkaleh to Jelamerik, and one way thence to the frontier, are also disturbed, and that some of the nomads are again carrying off sheep in the Berwor, near Kochannes, and near Gevver.

With the return of summer and the nomads from the south, this state of things can only be expected; but what is more serious is, that it is said that the officials in some parts do not seriously endeavour to repress such crime. The Vali, however, assures me that he never hears of any such crime without immediately taking the necessary measures on behalf of public security and justice.

In the immediate neighbourhood of Van, on the road to Bitlis and to Argish round the lake, there is very little of this highway robbery; but Kerim, the Russian brigand, is said to be hovering somewhere near Argish and Pergri.

I have, &c.

(Signed) G. P. DEVEY.

No. 60.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received July 12.)

(No. 256.)

Therapia, July 8, 1889.

My Lord,

IN your despatch No. 233 of the 25th July of last year, your Lordship instructed me to ascertain whether it was true that the Porte was arranging to bring into the country about Van large bodies of Circassians, and to settle them there. At that time Her Majesty's Consul at Erzeroum was unable to discover this to be the case, but I have now received a despatch from him, copy of which is herewith inclosed, reporting that a number of Circassians now at Trebizond are to be established in the Van district. I have instructed Sir A. Sandison to make inquiries on this subject at the Porte.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 60.

Colonel Chermside to Sir W. White.

Erzeroum, June 26, 1889.

Sir,

WITH reference to my despatch of the 14th August, 1888, in answer to a telegram by your Excellency of the 12th August, I have the honour to inform your Excellency that there is at Trebizond a number of Circassian families, stated to be over 100, which it is proposed to establish in the Van district.

These families have passed the winter there.

Her Majesty's Consul at Trebizond mentioned they were to go to Van, and a Circassian gentleman, a Government official here, confirmed it.

He stated that as there were considerable settlements of Circassians in the Van and Bitlis Vilayets previous to the Convention spoken of in above-mentioned despatch, the Russian authorities took no notice of small additional emigration.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HERBERT CHERMSIDE.

No. 61.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received July 14, 4·15 P.M.)

(No. 38. Secret.)

(Telegraphic.)

Constantinople, July 14, 1889, 2·50 P.M.

MOUSSA BEY and Armenians: Your Lordship's despatch No. 220 of the 1st instant.

The alleged arrest of the members of an Armenian deputation is not only absolutely denied in official Turkish circles, but is not even believed in by leading members of the Armenian community. The latter appear still doubtful whether witnesses will come forward to give evidence against Moussa Bey.

The Minister of Justice has not yet decided what Court is to try this Kurdish Chief, but I am assured at the Porte that his trial will take place at Constantinople, and be a public one.

No. 62.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received by telegraph, July 14.)

(No. 268. Secret. Ext. 38.)

Therapia, July 14, 1889.

My Lord,

WITH reference to your Lordship's despatch No. 220 of the 1st instant on the subject of Moussa Bey's outrages on Armenians, I have the honour to inform your Lordship that the story of the arrest of an Armenian Deputation not only meets with an absolute denial in Turkish official circles, but is discredited even by prominent members of the Armenian community.

It appears that the latter are still uncertain as to whether the evidence of the witnesses in the case of Moussa Bey will be forthcoming.

The Porte assures me that the trial of this notorious Kurdish Chief will be publicly held at Constantinople, but the Court which is to try it has not been decided on by the Minister of Justice.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

No. 63.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received July 15.)

(No. 262.)

Therapia, July 11, 1889.

My Lord,

IN my despatch No. 237 of the 28th ultimo I stated that I had telegraphed to Her Majesty's Vice-Consul at Van to inquire whether he had been able to ascertain anything with regard to the telegram sent by the Vali of Van to the Sublime Porte, stating that revolutionary papers had been discovered on the bodies of brigands proving them to be political agents, I have now the honour to transmit a paraphrase of Mr. Devey's telegraphic reply which reached me yesterday. From this your Lordship will perceive that the papers which are said to be of a revolutionary nature have been communicated to Mr. Devey, and he considers the Vali's interpretation of them a coloured one.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 63.

Vice-Consul Devey to Sir W. White.

(Telegraphic.)

Van, July 9, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to report that two men carrying arms, schoolmasters by profession, who had arrived from Persia with the object of stirring up sedition, were killed in an encounter with the zaptiehs. The seditious documents found on the men above mentioned have been handed to me by the Vali for communication to your

Excellency. His Excellency the Vali's account of this incident, which appeared in the Constantinople papers of 25th June, is, in my opinion, somewhat exaggerated.

Full information on this subject, contained in my despatches to Colonel Chermside, should reach Constantinople before the end of the month.

No. 64.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received July* 26.)

(No. 276. Confidential.)

Therapia, July 17, 1889.

My Lord,

ON receipt of your Lordship's despatch No. 220 of the 1st instant, inclosing a letter from Mr. Hagopian on the subject of the alleged arrest of the members of an Armenian deputation, I at once instructed Mr. Marinitch to make the necessary inquiries on the subject, and I have now the honour of inclosing a Memorandum by that gentleman giving the information he has been able to obtain.

From it your Lordship will perceive that no such incident has occurred lately, and it would seem that the circumstance which gave rise to these rumours may have been the arrest of certain Armenians at Van about a year ago.

I take this opportunity of inclosing a further Memorandum by Mr. Marinitch reporting on the presentation to His Imperial Majesty the Sultan of a Memorial by a deputation consisting of nine Armenians from Moush, praying that Moussa Bey may be brought to trial, and stating that the memorialists are ready to undergo punishment themselves if they fail to prove the charges in question.

In the midst of conflicting statements as to the intention of the witnesses to appear in support of the charges against Moussa and assertions made that they will not come forward, I am at a loss what to believe or to expect.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 64.

Memorandum by Mr. Marinitch.

(Secret and Confidential.)

J'AI appris que Vendredi dernier à la cérémonie du Selamlik une députation de neuf Arméniens de Moush ont présenté une requête à Sa Majesté le Sultan disant qu'ils sont prêts à prouver les crimes et méfaits imputés au Chef Kurde, Moussa Bey, priant Sa Majesté de les faire juger et déclarant qu'ils soient punis dans le cas où il sera constaté que leurs accusations sont dénuées de fondement.

Le Sultan a fait prendre la Pétition et après l'avoir lue lui-même, l'a fait transmettre d'urgence au Ministre de la Justice pour les fins requises.

Les Arméniens qui veulent être jugés avec Moussa Bey ont déjà engagé des avocats pour défendre leur cause devant le Tribunal. Des démarches ont été déjà faites par les Arméniens auprès du Ministre de la Justice afin de savoir devant quel Tribunal ils allaient être jugés. Mais le Tribunal qui devra se saisir de l'affaire n'est pas encore désigné.

Les Arméniens se disent prêts à faire valoir leurs griefs contre Moussa Bey et sont décidés à marcher résolument devant la justice, comprenant fort bien que tout retard apporté par eux se prêterait à des commentaires très fâcheux, et c'est une question d'honneur pour eux, disent-ils, de se présenter sans hésiter devant la justice Ottomane.

On m'assure que lorsque, il y a un an, la Porte avait appris les méfaits de Moussa Bey, elle avait décidé d'expulser ce Chef Kurde de l'Asie et faire cesser ainsi la cause des plaintes des Arméniens. Mais le retard apporté par le Grand Vézir à mettre cette mesure à exécution a fourni au Sultan l'occasion de le faire venir à Constantinople pour le faire juger avec ses adversaires. Voici d'après mes informations ce qui s'est passé il y a six mois.

Des Arméniens domestiques du Palais étaient en train de causer entre eux un jour, lorsque le Sultan les a aperçu par hasard et a voulu s'enquérir du motif de cette réunion. On aurait dit à Sa Majesté que c'étaient des Arméniens qui parlaient contre Moussa Bey. Le Sultan a de suite mandé auprès de lui un ou deux de ces individus, qui sans hésiter ont dit à Sa Majesté que Moussa Bey était un brigand et un assassin, et que grâce à la tolérance des autorités il avait commis toutes sortes d'atrocités.

C'est sur cela que Sa Majesté a donné l'ordre de le faire venir à Constantinople en dépit de la décision que la Porte avait prise de l'expulser.

Aujourd'hui on se trouve en face de deux mesures dictées contre cet individu, et il reste à savoir si après tout le Gouvernement ne se décidera pas à l'expulser pour ne pas permettre son jugement public, qui pourrait dévoiler des faits et gestes des autorités dans lesquels la responsabilité de la Sublime Porte se trouverait peut-être engagée.

J'apprends que Moussa Bey n'est plus l'hôte de Bahri Pacha, mais qu'il demeure ailleurs sous la surveillance de la police.

La crainte des accusateurs est que les débats du procès ne se fassent à huit clos, car dans ce cas la justice ne sera pas impartiale. Ils soutiennent que si les débats sont publics ils gagneront leur cause, parce qu'ils ont, disent-ils, des preuves accablantes à faire valoir.

Le Patriarche se propose aussi d'attaquer Moussa Bey pour les actes et sacrilèges qu'il a commis au mépris de la nation et de la religion Arménienne; mais il laissera d'abord les accusateurs se faire juger pour des faits ayant un caractère privé et n'agira pour les crimes ayant un caractère public que plus tard, lorsqu'il se rendra compte de la marche du procès qui sera intenté par les Arméniens.

(Signé) H. MARINITCH.

Péra, le 10 *Juillet*, 1889.

Inclosure 2 in No. 64.

Memorandum by Mr. Marinitch on Lord Salisbury's Despatch No. 220 *of July* 1, 1889.

IN obedience to the instructions conveyed to me by Her Majesty's Ambassador, I made inquiries in order to ascertain whether Mr. Hagopian's complaint was correct, and, in answer, I have the honour to report, on information obtained from trustworthy sources, that there is a misunderstanding in that gentleman's statements. Neither a single person of the Armenian deputation, who recently waited on the Grand Vizier to present a Petition on behalf of natives of Moush now residing at Constantinople, requesting the punishment of the notorious Kurdish Chief Moussa Bey, has been arrested by His Highness, nor is it contemplated for the present to exile to Tripoli any one of them.

The circumstance which must have given rise to such a report is probably that about one year ago the Turkish authorities at Van had arrested and banished some Armenians for alleged conspiracy against the Ottoman Government, but these people have been lately pardoned by the Sultan, and have already been allowed to return to their homes.

(Signed) H. MARINITCH.

Pera, July 10, 1889.

No. 65.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received July* 26.)

(No. 279. Most Confidential.)

Therapia, July 19, 1889.

My Lord,

ON receipt of an invitation from the Armenian Patriarch to pay him a visit a few days ago, Mr. Marinitch submitted to me the question of the advisability of his complying with his request.

I gave him the requisite authority, but instructed him, at the same time, to be very guarded in his conversation, and to be careful neither to state that he had received my authority to pay this visit, nor to raise the Patriarch's hopes in any way.

Mr. Marinitch was further to obtain, if possible, an account of all the cases collected by the Armenians themselves here against Moussa Bey, and to ascertain what steps they intended to take to bring home these charges to him, that is to say, whether the accusations were to be submitted to a Court of Law, and whether the requisite evidence against the Bey would be forthcoming.

I have now the honour to inclose a Memorandum by Mr. Marinitch, embodying the substance of the conversation he had with the Armenian Patriarch.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 65.

Memorandum by Mr. Marinitch.

(Confidentiel.)

JE me suis rendu hier dans l'après-midi à Makri-keuy pour visiter le Patriarche Arméno-Grégorien, dans sa maison de campagne, et je m'empresse de rapporter à l'Ambassade de Sa Majesté le langage qu'il m'a tenu. Il va sans dire que durant toute la conversation je me suis conformé en tout point aux instructions que son Excellence l'Ambassadeur a bien voulu me transmettre par le canal de Mr. Lowther.

Le Patriarche a commencé par me dire que le Chef Kurde, Moussa Bey, est arrivé à Constantinople, et qu'il a présenté une requête à Sa Majesté le Sultan, en déclarant qu'il était prêt à se faire juger avec ses accusateurs.

Ensuite le Patriarche m'a informé que le Ministre de la Justice lui a adressé une lettre disant que son Département avait reçu l'ordre de se saisir de l'affaire, et que dès lors ceux parmi les Arméniens se trouvant à Constantinople ou dans les provinces qui avaient des plaintes à faire valoir contre Moussa Bey n'avaient qu'à prendre leurs dispositions.

Le Patriarche m'a répété que les accusateurs avaient déjà choisi leurs avocats, et que ceux parmi les habitants de Mousb qui doivent participer au procès de ce Chef Kurde sont sur le point de partir pour Constantinople.

Le Patriarche m'a fait observer que jusqu'ici les victimes des méfaits de Moussa Bey ont eu de la répugnance à se faire juger sur les lieux. D'abord, parce qu'ils avaient tout lieu de croire qu'il leur était impossible d'obtenir justice en face de l'influence et prestige énormes dont ce Chef Kurde jouit auprès des autorités locales; et, en second lieu, parce qu'il était facile à cet individu, qui dispose, de même que tous les autres Chefs Kurdes, de beaucoup d'argent, de gagner les Juges à sa cause; et enfin, parce qu'ils n'auraient pas pu se soustraire à sa vengeance s'ils auraient réussi à avoir gain de cause. Aujourd'hui, ajoute le Patriarche, la situation a changé. Ces Arméniens veulent se faire juger à Constantinople, où les Magistrats, n'étant pas à la merci des influences locales, pourront leur rendre justice, surtout si, comme le Patriarche le croit, leur procès se jugera devant le Tribunal Criminel, et que les débats seront publics.

Les accusateurs, m'a fait remarquer le Patriarche, loin de vouloir hésiter à demander justice, n'attendent pour s'y présenter que le Ministre de la Justice veuille leur désigner le Tribunal devant lequel ils auront à se faire juger. Ces accusateurs, ajoute le Patriarche, disposent de témoignages en leur faveur pour pouvoir suffisamment prouver les crimes commis depuis un an et demi tant par Moussa Bey que par quelques autres Chefs Kurdes du même acabit.

Voici, au dire du Patriarche, les crimes perpétrés par ces individus. Ils ont commis des viols, pillé des maisons particulières, perpétré des meurtres, brûlé vifs des individus, roulé d'autres dans des peaux qu'ils ont jetés aux chiens pour être dévorés, cassé des bras et des jambes à des personnes innocentes, soumis les habitants à des impositions illégales, pillé et profané des églises, jeté la croix dans des ordures et commis une foule d'autres méfaits qu'ils seraient trop long à énumérer. La preuve de l'un de ces outrages devrait, dit-il, suffire pour les condamner.

De tout ce qui précède, il résulte, dit le Patriarche, que les accusateurs ont suffisamment de quoi faire punir Moussa Bey et ses acolytes si les Magistrats se montrent impartiaux et justes.

Le Patriarche déplore profondément que la Sublime Porte n'ait jamais cru devoir prendre en sérieuse considération les diverses communications qu'il a adressées au Gouvernement Impérial pour se plaindre amèrement des méfaits commis par ces Kurdes, et si, dit le Patriarche, la Porte s'était décidée alors d'éloigner ces Chefs Kurdes, la situation se serait améliorée et les griefs des Arméniens auraient cessé depuis lors. L'éloignement de ces criminels n'était pas difficile à réaliser, a ajouté le Patriarche, d'autant plus que lorsque Abédine Pacha avait été envoyé en mission plusieurs Chefs Kurdes avaient été expulsés et envoyés à Constantinople, où ils ont réussi à obtenir l'autorisation de rentrer dans leurs foyers pour continuer leurs actes répréhensibles.

Le Patriarche tient, dit-il, à faire constater, tant à Sa Majesté le Sultan qu'à son Gouvernement, que les Arméniens ne sont pas animés d'idées subversives comme on les en accuse, et, qu'au contraire, ils se considèrent très heureux de rester sous le sceptre bienfaitem du Sultan, et qu'ils ne demandent qu'à se livrer paisiblement à leurs travaux agricoles et à être à l'abri de l'injustice et de l'oppression.

C'est dans cet ordre d'idées que le Patriarche, voulant épargner de la peine à Sa Majesté le Sultan et des embarras à son Gouvernement, m'a exprimé très confidentielle-

ment l'avis personnel qu'il serait plus sage pour la Porte de se décider à expulser de suite Moussa Bey et quelques autres Chefs Kurdes, dont la présence à Moush, Van, Diarbékir, et Bitlis tient sans cesse en émoi les habitants paisibles parmi les Musulmans et les Arméniens. Le Patriarche estime que le jugement public de Moussa Bey révèlera des faits graves qui entraîneront des responsabilités et des conséquences qu'il est difficile de prévoir. Ces faits seront connus en Europe et surtout en Angleterre, qui prend un intérêt à la question, et ils feront le tour de la presse, qui les commentera à sa guise; et sans parler de la position désagréable qui sera créée au Gouvernement Ottoman, le Gouvernement Britannique sera accablé de questions et d'interpellations. Dès lors le Patriarche croit que le meilleur moyen serait de recourir à une mesure d'expulsion, qui trancherait la question d'une façon satisfaisante pour la Porte.

Le Patriarche dit que les Kurdes sont tous armés et que les Arméniens ne peuvent avoir aucune arme, et que de cette façon il leur est impossible de se défendre lorsqu'ils se voient attaqués.

Le Patriarche m'a dit aussi que la fille Arménienne qui avait été enlevée dans le temps par Moussa Bey vient d'être remise au Métropolite de Moush pour être rendue à ses parents.

Péra, le 13 Juillet, 1889. (Signé) H. MARINITCH.

No. 66.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received July 26.*)

(No. 285.)

My Lord, *Therapia, July 22*, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to report that the Vali of Bitlis has been removed, and Raouf Pasha, formerly Governor of Jerusalem, and recently Governor of Beirut, has been appointed in his place.

Aziz Pasha, former Vali of Yemen, has been appointed Vali of Beirut, and his Excellency Tahir Pasha has been appointed Vali of the Province of Mosal.

His Excellency Raouf Pasha enjoys a good reputation, and the appointment is a judicious one. At the time of his Excellency leaving Jerusalem, Mr. Consul Moore gave a favourable account of him in his despatch No. 10 of the 6th May, of which a copy accompanied my despatch to your Lordship No. 190 of the 24th May.

The change at Bitlis is of considerable importance at this moment on account of the complaints of the Armenian Christians inhabiting that district.

I had mentioned to the Grand Vizier repeatedly the advisability of sending good and honest men there, and I am sure that His Highness has exerted himself greatly with the Sultan to effect this change.

I know, however, nothing of Tahir Pasha.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

No. 67.

Saïd Pasha to Rustem Pasha.—(*Communicated to the Marquis of Salisbury by Rustem Pasha, July 31.*)

M. l'Ambassadeur, *Le 25 Juillet*, 1889.

DANS les discours qu'il a prononcés à propos des affaires Arméniennes, Lord Salisbury avait parlé des bandes qui viennent du dehors commettre leurs méfaits sur le territoire Ottoman.

A l'appui de cette assertion, je crois devoir signaler à votre Excellence deux crimes commis dernièrement encore sur notre frontière dans des circonstances analogues. Une bande de vingt brigands dont sept de la tribu des Hamavends, et treize de la tribu des Menkiours, toutes deux de la Perse, ayant fait son apparition sur notre territoire, quatre détachements de gendarmes et de soldats Ottomans furent envoyés à sa poursuite. Dans une rencontre qui s'ensuivit avec le détachement placé sous le commandement du tabour Agha Osman Bey, le neveu de celui-ci fut tué par les bandits. Poursuivie jusqu'à la frontière par Osman Bey, cette bande se réfugia sur le territoire Persan; mais bientôt après, le fils de la victime, Saïd Bey, était également tué pendant qu'il effectuait la perception de la taxe des moutons dans ces parages. Les fauteurs de ces méfaits trouvent un asile sur le territoire Persan.

Ces faits prouvent une nouvelle fois combien les accusations lancées contre nous sont injustes et combien Lord Salisbury est dans la vérité. En vue d'affermir sa Seigneurie dans cette conviction, je prie votre Excellence de vouloir bien lui faire part de ce qui précède.

Veuillez, &c.
(Signé) SAÏD.

No. 68.

Télégram addressed from Van to the Grand Vizier.—(Communicated to the Marquis of Salisbury by Rustem Pasha, August 9.)

Van, le 11 (23) *Juillet*, 1889.

(Traduction.)

AKRIBASSIAN OHAUNÈS, de Van; Vartan, sujet Russe; le fugitif Kaulaksizian, de Van, et leurs compagnons avaient trouvé le châtiment qu'ils méritaient au moment où, ayant dépassé la frontière du côté de la Perse, ils se livraient au brigandage dans l'intention séditieuse de troubler la paix et la tranquillité publiques, ainsi qu'il est confirmé par les papiers trouvés sur eux et par d'autres informations véridiques.

Nous apprenons maintenant que les nommés Terzi Backi Agha Artin, Kéckich Agha Ohaunès, Maroutian Mighirditch, quelques prêtres et leurs compagnons qui, sans être élus par le peuple, continuent à fréquenter, contrairement aux dispositions du Règlement *ad hoc*, l'Archevêché en qualité de membres des Conseils civils et religieux et dont nous avons précédemment exposé tant au Palais Impérial qu'à votre Altesse et au Patriarcat les actions et opinions subversives et intéressées, avaient répandu la fausse rumeur que les brigands susmentionnés n'étaient que de simples voyageurs et qu'ils avaient été tués injustement.

Comme il est probable que les membres et affiliés des Comités révolutionnaires siégeant à l'étranger, dont les dits brigands étaient des agents, fassent accroire dans certains pays que les Arméniens de Turquie sont en communion d'idées avec eux, nous osons, dans le but de proclamer la vérité, soumettre ce qui suit aux pieds du trône de Sa Majesté Impériale le Sultan.

Les Arméniens de Van ne se sont associés et ne s'associeront jamais aux faits et gestes auxquels des individus tels qu'Akribassian, Koulaksizian, et autres aventuriers de cette catégorie, poussés par des intrigants et des malveillants agissant de l'étranger, viennent, sous le prétexte et la fausse apparence de patriotisme et d'aspirations nationales, se livrer contre le Gouvernement Impérial, en vue de soulever des troubles. L'histoire est là pour constater que grâce à la justice paternelle de Sa Majesté Impériale le Sultan, tous les Arméniens vivant sous l'égide du Gouvernement Impérial ont toujours conservé, dans une mesure qui n'a de pareille dans aucun des autres pays où se trouvent également des Arméniens, leur religion, leur langue, et leur nationalité et qu'ils y ont pleinement joui de tous les avantages de la tranquillité et de la paix. C'est donc en reconnaissance de ces bienfaits que les Arméniens continueront sûrement à marcher dans la voie de la fidélité et du dévouement dont ils ne se sont pas départis jusqu'à présent. Ceux qui préfèrent observer une conduite contraire sont comme les susnommés Akribassian, Koulaksizian, et consorts, des gens incapables de discerner le bien du mal et qui, ne possédant aucun bien, se nourrissent d'idées ambitieuses et cupides, en un mot, des gens sans aveu et sans profession dont les semblables se trouvent également et en plus grand nombre dans tous les pays et parmi toutes les autres nations. De même, les nouvelles ouvertement fausses que les susnommés Terzi Backi Oghlou Artin et consorts ont publiées sous la signature de certaines personnes de la crédulité et de la simplicité desquelles ils avaient abusé, en leur faisant croire à des informations erronées et malveillantes, ne peuvent avoir été forgées que dans une intention hostile au Gouvernement Impérial et à la nation Arménienne. Nous osons déclarer par conséquent qu'ils n'avaient d'autre but que de mettre une arme entre les mains de certaines perturbateurs Arméniens qui, dans quelques pays d'Europe, se livrent à des agissements nuisibles contre le Gouvernement Impérial ou, pour mieux dire, pêchent en eau trouble pour le succès de leurs intrigues.

En soumettant ce qui précède aux pieds du trône de Sa Majesté Impériale nous osons la supplier de daigner continuer à ses fidèles sujets Arméniens sa bienveillance souveraine qui constitue leur unique soution et fait leur seule ambition.

(Suivent 131 signatures.)

No. 69.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received August 9.)

(No. 297. Confidential.)

My Lord, *Therapia, July 29, 1889.*

WITH reference to my despatch to your Lordship No. 241 of the 1st instant, forwarding copy of Mr. Devey's despatch of the 15th June to Colonel Chermside, I have the honour to inclose copy of a further despatch from Mr. Devey of the 28th ultimo, which I have received from Her Majesty's Consul at Erzeroum.

In this despatch Mr. Devey confirms his previous impression, that most of the signatories of the Armenian "Mazbata," which formed the subject of his previous despatch, belonged to the new party of Natanian Karabed Effendi, and threw considerable doubt on the authenticity of many of the other signatures, the list of which he has examined.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 69.

Vice-Consul Devey to Consul Chermside.

(Confidential.)

Sir, *Van, June 28, 1889.*

IN respect of the "Mazbata" mentioned in my despatch of the 15th instant, as being addressed to His Majesty the Sultan by a section of the Armenians of Van, and of which I have now seen various copies published in numerous Constantinople journals, I have the honour to state that I have examined the list of 113 signatures thereto attached, and have every reason to confirm what I previously asserted, viz., that th persons who signed were mostly of the new party headed by Natanian Karabed Effendi and that it should not necessarily be regarded as a general expression of the sentiments of even the Armenian townsmen. The majority of the chief families did not sign; of those who did, thirty-five distinct families may be counted: of these, three surnames have been counted twice, and two three times. Thirty-eight names are repeated as representing brothers, or near relations living in the same house; the remaining forty names appear to be entirely unknown: they might be servants in the households referred to, or, if separate families, are probably of so little account that not even the publication of their names in the newspapers suffices to withdraw them from their present unpretentious obscurity.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

No. 70.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received August 9.)

(No. 300.)

My Lord, *Therapia, July 29, 1889.*

WITH reference to previous correspondence on the subject of outrages perpetrated by Kurds in the district of Urumiah, I have the honour to inclose herewith to your Lordship copy of a despatch addressed by Mr. Vice-Consul Devey to Her Majesty's Consul at Erzeroum of the 6th instant, copy of which I have received from that gentleman.

In this despatch Mr. Devey reports that Messrs. MacDowell and Wishart, two American missionaries, have been maltreated by the Nestorians of Ikhouba, and that the Vali is inquiring into the matter.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 70.

Vice-Consul Devey to Consul Chermside.

Van, July 6, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to inform you that two Armenian missionaries, Messrs. MacDowell and Wishard, of Urumiah, while returning there last May in company with several helpers and others after a journey in Hekkiari, were plundered, insulted, and maltreated by Ikhouba Nestorians inhabiting the village of Gundiktha. This affair has been brought to the notice of his Excellency the Vali, who is causing the necessary inquiry to be held.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

No. 71.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received August* 9.)

(No. 303. Confidential.)

Therapia, July 30, 1889.

My Lord,

WITH reference to my despatch No. 262 of the 11th instant, I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of a despatch from Her Majesty's Consul at Erzeroum, inclosing a Report by Mr. Vice-Consul Devey with regard to the revolutionary papers said to have been found on the bodies of Armenians killed as brigands on the Bashkaleh road.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 71.

Consul Chermside to Sir W. White.

(Confidential.)

Ardish, Lake Van, July 15, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Excellency one copy of Mr. Devey's despatch and its inclosures, on which subject telegraphic communication has also passed between Mr. Devey and your Excellency. There seems no doubt as to the seditious purposes of the three Armenians mentioned, nor, I think, as to the genuineness of some of the documents.

As I have pointed out in former private and official Reports, I have had no doubt as to the existence of disaffection, revolutionary aspirations, and also a certain degree of political restlessness among the Armenians of the Van district, and in a far more marked degree in that district than elsewhere.

At the same time, the above is not a matter that could *per se* cause real disquietude to the Porte, the capacity for organization and cohesion being a minimum, and the importance of such feeling depending on external support. The hollowness and puerility of the farce of the three pedagogues masquerading as brigands is best illustrated from their diary. (Inclosure No. 4 in Mr. Devey's despatch.)

As pointed out by Mr. Devey, the appeal to public opinion in print by the publication of the Governor-General's telegram is a new departure in Turkish diplomacy, which has hitherto maintained a uniform and dignified silence under just or unjust attacks.

I have, &c.
(Signed) H. CHERMSIDE.

Inclosure 2 in No. 71.

Vice-Consul Devey to Colonel Chermside.

(Confidential.)

Van, July 6, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to inform you that the Vali has handed to me the papers, of which translations are inclosed, stating that the Central Government had requested

him to do so, with the view that they should be ultimately brought to the notice of Her Majesty's Government. There is every reason to believe that the papers are genuine, and there can be little doubt that they were found upon or among the belongings of the three Armenians, of whom two were killed a month ago near Choukh Gedik Pass.

In the Constantinople newspapers of Tuesday, the 25th June, a detailed account of this affair was published. At present I have seen only the papers "Oriental Advertiser" and "Saadet," but hear that translations appeared in all the Armenian papers, which were taken from the official "Tarik." As the "Saadet" claims to give a copy of a telegram from Van signed by the Vali of Van, Khalil (while the translation in the "Oriental Advertiser" is neither exact nor complete), I would wish to make some few remarks on it, and beg leave to express the opinion that the publication was not altogether discreet nor justifiable on the part of so high-placed a functionary as the Vali; that it is inaccurate in detail, and is calculated to give a false impression of Armenian revolutionary designs as regards Turkish Armenians, and that it will be found to have provoked much hostile criticism.

Before reviewing the account given by the Vali, it would be well to set forth what may be considered to be as near the truth as could possibly be gathered from the many conflicting statements set afloat in respect of this unhappy affair.

Two young men of Van, named Kulaksizian and Akribesian Ohannes (the latter has a brother resident here), went some time ago as school teachers to a large Armenian village, Hepteyan, of the Sahuas district in Persia. On the night of the 28th May last they started in disguise from Heftevan for Van in company with a Caucasian Armenian from Karabagh, named Vartan, evidently intending to promote sedition among the Turkish Armenians, and the poor success they met with may be gathered from their expressions about "stealing cheese" (*vide* Inclosure 4), which might perhaps be guessed to stand for winning recruits. On the ninth or tenth day out it seems they were resting to dine at the spring called Ganespi (near a village and pass of the same name), when a caravan including four zaptiehs and a telegraph "chaoush" and two muleteers approached from above. The Armenians endeavoured to escape observation, but the zaptiehs called to them to come and say who they were, and give up their guns. They replied they were travellers going to Van, and needed their guns to protect themselves, and would not give them up to zaptiehs, but to the proper authorities at Van. The zaptiehs then fired on them, killing Vartan on the spot. Kulaksizian made his escape; he has gone to Tiflis, and is, I believe, intending to proceed to London. Akribesian took shelter behind some rocks and opened fire on the zaptiehs, wounding one and killing a horse. He then rushed out on them, and though he received a ball in the leg, succeeded in dealing some severe wounds with his "kamma" (large Persian dagger) before he fell, when the zaptiehs are said to have mauled him severely, dragging his body about the rocks, and finally left him for dead, after seizing the rifles of the three, and the effects left behind by the cowardly Kulaksizian, who, the prime mover and inciter, is the first to desert his companions. The following morning several zaptiehs were sent out to bring in the corpses, and they found Akribesian living, I am told, and to prevent his telling tales, murdered him in cold blood. It is said that a considerable sum of money that should have been found on the Armenians had disappeared, and no mention made of it. The two corpses were buried the same day at Khoshab.

The Report of the Hamidiyyé Kaïmakam was to the effect that Russian brigands from Gumri (Alexandropol) had attacked the caravan, and two had been shot; but when the papers found on the Armenians had been brought in here and translated, the Vali at once (*i.e.*, a week or so later) dispatched Avedis Effendi Batevian (the police officer mentioned in Mr. Lamb's letter of the 24th December, 1885), who had the bodies exhumed, and came back to report that he recognized Kulaksizian, but that the other man was unknown to him, and probably from Russia. Shortly after news was received that Kulaksizian was in Persia, and unharmed. Thereon Avedis Effendi, accompanied by five or six persons, went to make a fresh examination on the 26th June, twenty days after the affray; this time the report was they were Akribesian and Vartan. Previously to this, two zaptiehs who had been severely wounded were said to have received a gratification in money, and Avedis Effendi had been honoured with the decoration of the fourth class of the Medjidié. On the 24th June the decoration of the first class of the Medjidié was presented to the Vali, presumably in acknowledgment of his Excellency's zeal in dispersing these revolutionary brigands, as according to the telegraphic version of the 20th ultimo. These rewards and decorations have not produced an entirely good effect, for murmurs may be heard

that zaptiehs are allowed to shoot down and murder individuals with the sanction and approval of the Government.

In considering the revolutionary aspect of this incident, I venture to think that an exaggerated view of its importance has been disseminated; many people here add purposely, and by the Vali, for the purposes of obtaining rewards for himself and his tools, and of confuting those Armenians who had protested passively or positively against the late manifesto signed under Natanian Karabed Effendi's auspices, as reported in my despatch of the 15th June.

M. Portukalian, the exiled schoolmaster often mentioned in previous correspondence of this Vice-Consulate, writes last April to his friend and correspondent Kulaksizian, a village schoolmaster in Persia, telling him an Armenian Patriotic Society has been formed, and asking him to promote it in these parts; he forwards a number of his journal "l'Arménie," and begs for news well authenticated from Van. Kulaksizian Karabed, a native of Van, was giving lessons in sundry schools here only about two years ago, but betook himself to Heftevan on account of what he considered to be the oppression of Armenians in Turkey. He there meets Akribesian, an ex-pupil of Portukalian, a brother school teacher, who, after trying various trades at Van, Batoum, Bitlis, Erzeroum, &c., had reverted again to pedagogy. Of Vartan, who was an intimate friend, while on a visit to Van eight years ago, of Akribesian, it is said that he also was teaching a school in a neighbouring village in Persia. These are the three persons who agree to come and stir up sedition in Turkey, and their proceedings may be learnt from Inclosure No. 4.

Kulaksizian has absolutely no influence here, and his two companions are all but unknown; it is said they purposed proceeding from here to Mush.

Next, there is the very damaging letter of Avedis Padighian, which mentions a Committee at Haftevan, recommends care that their organization be not discovered, speaks of deeds, not words, and refers to the Greek insurrection. Padighian, born a Protestant Armenian, of Bitlis, settled and married at Van several years ago. At one time he was running a chemist's shop, and has always practised photography, from which he earned a small livelihood. Hassan Pasha, the late Vali, used often to buy his photographs. About three years ago he made a contract with the authorities for taking the portraits of all malefactors in prison in the Vilayets Van, Bitlis, and Hekkiari, which was the reason of his visiting various places, including Bashkaleh and Mush. Last winter, on his return from the Caucasus, he got into trouble for having taken a view of the Castle Rock of Van. He was under arrest for a few hours, and on giving up the negative in question it was broken by the orders of the Tahur Aghassi.*

About this time, the last-named functionary was stated to be proposing to establish a female detective service, and wished to enlist the wife of this Avedis. You, Sir, can judge from your experience of the manners and customs of the country, and the strict seclusion and notions of propriety of Christian no less than Moslem women, what likelihood of success there was for such an idea, and whether the report then circulated, that the Tahur Aghassi had conceived a passion for the wife of Avedis, being a good-looking woman, may not have been true. As this woman was teaching in the Armenian missionaries' girls' school, leave was obtained for her to reside permanently within the missionaries' premises, and thus be out of reach of persecution.

Shortly after this, *i.e.*, last January, Avedis went off into Persia, thence to Tiflis and to London, where he was welcomed by the staff of the "Haiasdan" (*vide* their impression of the 15th June). As the "Haiasdan" states, there is no great danger in persons of the stamp of Avedis, a respectable middle-class Armenian, high and dry from the flood of local intrigue and quarrelling for office on account of his Protestant faith. The little danger there may be, and the positive harm, as I have mentioned elsewhere, is in the "Haiasdan" and "l'Arménie" themselves, in their circulating outrageous exaggerations of the miseries to which Armenians are sometimes subjected, and in their inciting, as in the present case, the weak minds or lively imaginations of their compatriots to foolish proceedings.

The photographer Avedis, however, need not have gone into voluntary exile, but that he suspected (quite mistakenly) that two photographs he had been weak enough to take shortly after the war had fallen into the hands of the police. The pictures were of two groups (of seven and of about a dozen) of Armenians with guns, and were inscribed "Armenia's children," or "band of patriots," or something of the kind.

* I beg leave to draw your attention again to remarks on Dervish Effendi in my Nos. 7 and 9 and other despatches.

I believe the revolutionists in question proceeded to no further overt act of rebellion than that of having their photographs taken.

As to the main accusation, viz., that a Committee exists in Heftevan, in Persia, for the purpose of stirring up revolt in Turkey, I am not in possession of any other information than what is contained in the inclosures forwarded, but, from internal evidence, should be inclined to believe that the propaganda had not spread wide nor taken deep root. The inclosures all date since the 18th March, 1889, and it is possible that the Committee consisted of no others than the three persons here named.

The Vali is playing with edged tools. He is opposing false representation to false representation, mazbata to mazbata, and intrigue to intrigue; though in this particular case he has a basis of truth to go on. In the Vali's telegram of the 20th June he speaks of brigands ("eshkia"). No act of brigandage can be adduced against the three schoolmasters who were masquerading at night in Kurdish costume except that they "stole cheese" (secured recruits) at the village Marsdoun. Zaptiehs are said to have been sent out to hunt down a body of eight brigands. These were the three Armenian schoolmasters, to whom five more were added at a considerable interval after the affray. The zaptiehs were accompanying a caravan which was bringing money and the wife of an army officer from Bashkaleh to Van, and were not sent out against brigands. But the Vali told me he had instructed the Hekkiari Mutessarif to be on the look out for robbers, and cause caravans to be escorted if necessary. The words "reis" (chiefs), implying of a band of revolutionists, is a misrepresentation. "Nos plus intimes amis" is the translation as it appears in Inclosure 4.

It is absolutely false to say that Padighian "agitatem (fersad)". He was reputed a respectable, inoffensive, and well-behaved man whilst here; travelled about the country under pretext of taking photographs, as the Vali must have known. It is calumny to say that Kulaksizian was taught sedition ("tahsil-i-fersadet") at Etchmiadzin, and it amounts to nothing less to say that brigandage is not unprecedented ("na messbuck olmeyub") among the Armenians. Kulaksizian was stated to have been killed on the mistaken report of Avedis Batevian. His escape, since proved, detracts much from the satisfaction that may be felt at the *fiasco* made by the sedition-mongers. I now hear that the Vali is about to send in a more correct version of the incident.

I trust, Sir, that I shall not have fatigued you unnecessarily with this mass of detail, and that you may be able to go with me in the main deduction that the Vali has overdrawn the affair as regarded in the light of an insurrectionary movement, and that it by no means reflects spotless lustre on those concerned.

Rushing into print is a new departure in Turkish provincial administration. The Constantinople press is not the same as the London dailies.

An army officer made the remark that "'bakal' (grocer), 'bogos' (as though one were to say, my 'chimney-sweep') would govern with more sense and prudence than Khalil Pasha."

I am, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

Inclosure 3 in No. 71.

M. Patignian to M. Koulaksizian.

(Traduction.)

Mon cher Ami, *Londres, le 25 Avril*, 1889.

HIER je suis arrivé ici et j'ai été reçu par M. H. Sévastian. Grâce à son bon accueil, j'ai pu éviter beaucoup de difficultés que j'aurais dû rencontrer dans une ville aussi peuplée que Londres.

Ayant donné votre adresse, ainsi que celles de quelques personnes, il vous a envoyé un journal qui certes sera pour vous une nouveauté.

Ce journal ayant gagné une grande réputation dans les cercles officiels Anglais, Français et Italiens, il y a lieu d'espérer que la question Arménienne sera protégée.

Pour vous donner plus d'espérance j'aurais bien voulu que vous lisiez les premiers numéros.

Le zèle que vous avez déployé étant un signe de progrès pour votre comité, cela m'a permis de vous mettre en évidence, et j'ai tout lieu de croire que le progrès se fera sentir.

J'ai lu dans le journal "l'Armenia" un article parlant de Van et contenant

quelques petites nouvelles me concernant, et quoique le susdit article n'eut pas de signature, je n'ai pas été long à comprendre que c'était vous qui l'aviez écrit.

Il est très-nécessaire que vous nous donniez des renseignements sur l'état actuel des habitants de Van, lesquels vous pouvez vous procurer par le canal des voyageurs. Veuillez aussi écrire vos articles brièvement, afin que les lecteurs ne s'en ennuient et qu'ils s'y intéressent.

Le rédacteur m'a montré l'enregistrement d'un abonnement pour le Gouvernement Russe.

Ce n'est qu'après des peines et souffrances insupportables durant trois mois que j'ai pu me rendre ici. J'attribue tout cela au peu de soins que l'on a pris chez vous de mes affaires.

Mon départ pour Khoï m'ayant coûté £ T. 10 il vaudrait mieux aller à Tauris.

A Batoum mes amis m'ont accueilli avec une grande joie, tandisque à Tiflis j'ai été dépouillé par des voleurs et des gens soi-disant amis; donc on trouve plus de patriotes à Batoum qu'à Tiflis.

N'ayant pas reçu de nouvelles de ma famille je vous prie de vouloir bien la saluer de ma part. J'ai voulu envoyer aussi un de mes journaux à M. Stépan; enfin saluez-le de ma part et dites-lui que les journaux expédiés à son adresse ont été remis à la poste aujourd'hui avec les vôtres.

Il ne faut pas que votre organisation soit découverte, car il arrive souvent que par vanité on s'attribue telle ou telle qualité qu'on ne possède réellement; aussi si vous voulez rendre des services à la patrie, vous devez d'abord préparer des hommes et de l'argent et procéder comme les Grecs, qui n'ont commencé à agir qu'après avoir gardé le secret de leur organisation pendant sept ans: il faut donc plus de faits que de paroles.

L'adresse du rédacteur est portée sur le journal: si notre journal ne vous parvenait pas, il pourrait se faire que M. Stépan reçoive le sien; alors vous auriez recours à son adresse.

Par omission j'ai oublié de joindre à l'adresse de Salmash le nom du village Heytevan que vous habitez..

Votre, &c.
(Signé) A. PATIGUIAN.

Inclosure 4 in No. 71.

M. Portugalian to M. Koulaksizian.

Marseille, le 27 Avril, 1889.

Estimable M. G. Koulaksizian, compatriote respecté à Heytevan,

A LA réception de votre lettre datée du 9 Avril, 1888, je me suis empressé de publier dans le journal "l'Armenia" tous les renseignements que vous m'avez envoyés, et recevez ci-joint un exemplaire que M. le Rédacteur m'a donné pour vous.

Quoique vous ne m'ayez plus écrit depuis votre dernière lettre j'ai reçu de vos nouvelles, et des renseignements superficiels par l'entremise de certains voyageurs de passage. Par ces nouvelles je vous exprime ma joie, et suis heureux de vous savoir en bonne santé, et professant la carrière de maître d'école dans un pays si habité par les Arméniens.

Vous me nommez bienfaiteur; sachez, cher ami, que je ne fais que remplir mon devoir, et de nouveau je vous remercie infiniment des bons sentiments que vous témoignez à mon égard.

Je vous serais très obligé si vous pouviez me donner quelques informations des pays vous avoisinants, et particulièrement sur Van: cependant faites attention que ces nouvelles soient fondées.

Dans les dernières feuilles du journal "l'Armenia" vous pouvez comprendre que nous avons créé une Société Patriotique; donc nous vous prions de faire tout votre possible pour le développement de notre Société dans votre pays.

Recevez aussi cinq exemplaires de notre Règlement.

Ayant appris que M. Ohanesso Okibassian et Stichan Adjemian se trouvent chez vous, veuillez les saluer de ma part. Inquiet de ne pas avoir des nouvelles de M. Roupin Adjemian, Professeur Constantinopolitain, qui se trouvait dans vos parages, nous avons recours à votre obligeance pour avoir des renseignements à son égard si vous en avez.

Dans le cas où vous ne receviez pas les feuilles de "l'Armenia" régulièrement, veuillez-nous dire quels sont les moyens nécessaires à employer pour les faire parvenir.

Recevez, &c.
(Signé) M. PORTUGALIAN.

Inclosure 5 in No. 71.

Extracts from the Diary of M. Koulaksizian.

(Traduction.)

NON . . . laissez-moi être tourmenté avec mes compatriotes. La foule vit encore dans les ténèbres et l'ignorance; je pourrai peut-être la secourir et essuyer les larmes de ses yeux.

Dans la nuit de Mardi, le 16 Mai, au 17 Mercredi, 1889, nous sommes parvenus à sortir de Haytevan; dans cette susdite nuit qui devait donner jour au Mercredi nous avons été obligés de tromper quelques personnes, même nos plus intimes amis, dans le but de réaliser notre départ en costume Kurde, ce qui nous rendait ridicules en présence de M. Movcesse Tatoyar, seul présent à la scène.

Au sortir de Haytevan nous nous sommes égarés, et après avoir marché toute la nuit nous arrivâmes à l'aube dans un vallon situé au bas du village Natcherva, pour y passer la journée, et nous remettre en route la nuit, ne pouvant voyager le jour.

Ce lieu, qui contient une dizaine de noyers séculaires et des fontaines aux eaux limpides, me font penser que ce site qui devait recevoir notre journée paraît avoir une signification sacrée; puisque les Kurdes n'y portent pas la main. Sur ce je vais dormir dans le creux d'un noyer; que Dieu me donne le repos!

Du 17 au 18 Mai nous quittons le vallon, sacré abri, de la veille à 12 h. 30 m. du soir, et nous nous engageons dans un chemin rempli de descentes et de montées; mais bientôt fatiguées, nous nous sommes jetés dans une ruine près Khassabara pour nous reposer et y passer la nuit: mais ce lieu étant froide et humide je n'ai pu dormir. Aussi au point du jour nous avons continué notre chemin jusque la frontière Turque; nous nous séparâmes du chemin Assirien, que nous laissions à notre gauche, pour nous diriger vers le nord, en nous précipitant à travers les rochers de la frontière Turque, où nous avons passé la journée.

Du 18 au 19 Mai, 1889, Vendredi, hors du village Biginzuerd (caza d'Alhok) nous avons dormi dans une église nommée Sainte Marie deux heures environ; ensuite nous nous sommes décidés à passer quatre journées dans une grotte près du village pour avoir une entrance avec Avedo.

Du 19 au 20 Mai, 1889, Samedi, nous sommes sortis de cette grotte, pour nous rendre à Tchouk, et chemin faisant nous sommes arrivés au village Marse, lieu de notre rendezvous. En ce lieu nous avons changé d'idée, et nous nous décidâmes d'envoyer Ohanesse A. à Baots-Kalé pour explorer les affaires de Monseigneur l'Evêque Ohanesse Pavouni. Quand à nous nous sommes restés dans une grotte qui était éloignée de deux heures environ du monastère.

Cette grotte avait environ 30 mètres de longueur, et l'on ne sait quelle est la cause de sa perforation. Cette grotte était très humide; tout nous portait à croire que les ours y habitent.

Ohanesse Akrabassian est parti. Le vol de fromage ne nous a pas réussi.

Le 21 Mai, 1889, Dimanche, Ohanesse Akrabassian n'a pas réussi à explorer les affaires de l'Evêque Ohanesse Pavouni; nous restons dans la grotte.

Le 22 Mai, 1889, Lundi, me rendant au village Marsdoun j'ai constaté les affaires de l'Evêque Ohanesse Pavouni, la misère et l'état moral des villageois; j'ai vu aussi de loin Bagdassar, du monastère de Hokostsvank. Après avoir volé du fromage nous nous sommes mis en route cette nuit.

Le 23 Mai, 1889, étant arrivé Mardi à la pointe du jour sur la montagne nous y sommes restés trois heures, et de là nous avons continué notre chemin, traversant les montagnes, et nous mangeâmes de beurre et buvâmes de l'eau de vie dans un vallon.

Le 24 Mai, 1889, Mercredi, chemin faisant nous sommes arrivés au sommet de Tchouk.

Inclosure 6 in No. 71.

Memorandum by M. Koulaksizian entitled "Ma dernière Décision, le 6 Mars, 1889."

(Traduction.)

JE suis à la fin de la dernière année où j'ai commencé à vivre et étant tombé dans le courant de la vie je ressemblais à un homme dont on avait bandé les yeux, qu'on avait isolé de la vie réelle, et qu'on gardait dans un monde imaginaire pendant de longues années ; enfin on donne la liberté à cet homme d'entrer dans la vie réelle, le pauvre homme ouvre les yeux bandés depuis plusieurs années, il tombe dans un tel monde qui est tout contraire à la vie qu'il a menée jusqu'alors, chaque obstacle qu'il rencontre le fait glisser, il bat les pieds, souvent il tombe, mais il prend courage pour se relever, il change de voie vers une autre direction espérant que cette nouvelle direction le conduira à un chemin plus juste, bien qu'il soit convaincu qu'il ne trouvera qu'un monde ressemblant plus ou moins à celui où il a vécu jusqu'alors.

Mais, hélas, il rencontre de nouveau les mêmes obstacles, il tombe de nouveau et se relève, et dans son désespoir il maudit sans savoir qui. . . . Il reprend courage pensant qu'il a lu dans un livre que le désespoir est une bassesse; il se rappelle aussi que lui-même a juré de ressembler un héros dont parle ce livre.

Cependant on ne lui a pas enseigné comment il faut s'y prendre. Il s'arrête un moment, regarde autour de lui; il voit partout la misère, la persécution, la bassesse, et la corruption humaine. Songeant à son enfance, il se frotte le front, et l'image effrayante du passé se présente à ses yeux; il voit les supplices que ses parents ont soufferts, il voit ses compatriotes abandonnés et en désespoir par la persécution des cruels Turcs.

Enfin il se souvient qu'il a juré dans son enfance de secourir ses compatriotes quand il grandira et de ne pas se laisser traiter si impitoyablement.

Cet homme avait cet idéal, et lorsqu'on lui bandait les yeux il a pris l'engagement de suivre cet idéal jusqu'à la fin de sa vie, et de travailler pour la cause sacrée du bonheur de ses malheureux compatriotes; c'est pour cette cause qu'il s'est laissé bander les yeux, pensant que sa force serait plus grande quand il travaillerait pour la réalisation de cet idéal. Les deux années de ma vie se sont écoulées de la même manière; mais mes yeux aussi étaient bandés; on ne m'avait pas non plus appris ce qui était nécessaire à mes penchants. Enfin, après être tombé il se relève, et après avoir tâtonné sans cesse durant les deux années, je me suis décidé à mourir pour la cause sacrée du bonheur d'un peuple malheureux.

Voilà quel était mon idéal, et ma résolution est de quitter la vie que j'ai menée jusqu'à présent et de m'appliquer à . . . . qui pour le moment est le moyen principal de servir cette cause; c'est ma résolution inébranlable, que je suivrai jusqu'à la fin.

(Signé) G. KOULAKSIZIAN.

No. 72.

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received August* 13.)

Addington Park, Croydon, August 12, 1889.

My Lord,

YOUR Lordship will, I am sure, be pleased to hear that Mr. Browne having been to Van to pay his respects to the Vali, has found him most kind. He has received the assurance of the Vali that he would render him all the assistance in his power towards the providing of schools, and that if the Nestorian Patriarch, Mar Shimoon, would write him a letter requesting leave to open schools, in which he stipulates that Turkish and Arabic should be taught, he will endeavour to obtain permission for the purpose, and that Mar Shimoon will be at liberty to give land for the building of the school.

Mar Shimoon has accordingly given land. His application is to include a request for leave to the English missionaries to teach in the schools, which, as I understand, are to be not "English" schools, but Mar Shimoon's schools. The Vali seemed to consider it desirable that the Nestorians should not be left in such extreme ignorance.

I am sure that this friendliness on the part of the Turkish authorities must be very largely due to the representations which, by your Lordship's desire, Her Majesty's Ambassador has made to the Porte.

I desire to express my best thanks for the great service done to us by his Excellency, and I further venture to request that, when Mar Shimoon's despatch is

presented to the Porte, it may receive all that support which his Excellency is able to give by seconding the request, with all due acknowledgment for what has been already done.

I have, &c.
(Signed) EDW. CANTUAR.

No. 73.

The Marquis of Salisbury to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Foreign Office, August 17, 1889.

My Lord Archbishop,

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Grace's letter of the 12th instant, and to express the satisfaction with which I have heard of the friendly attitude adopted by the Vali of Van towards the Mission to the Nestorians, and of his offer to support the application of the Nestorian Patriarch, Mar Shimoon, for permission to open schools.

A copy of your Grace's communication will be forwarded to Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople.

I have, &c.
(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 74.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.

Foreign Office, August 19, 1889.

(No. 271.)

Sir,

I TRANSMIT to your Excellency herewith a copy of a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury,* reporting the friendly attitude adopted by the Vali of Van towards the Mission to the Nestorians, and the offer of his Excellency to support an application by the Nestorian Patriarch for permission to open schools.

His Grace expresses his thanks for the services rendered by you to the Mission, as well as a hope that when Mar Shimoon's request reaches the Porte, it will receive your Excellency's support.

I am, &c.
(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 75.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received August* 23.)

Therapia, August 13, 1889.

(No. 324.)

My Lord,

WITH reference to my despatch No. 276 of the 17th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit a copy of a despatch from Colonel Chermside, forwarding a despatch from Mr. Devey, who states that several persons are proceeding to Constantinople to bring accusations against Moussa Boy.

Mr. Devey also reports a fresh murder at Van.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 75.

Colonel Chermside to Sir W. White.

Van, July 26, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Excellency a copy of a despatch from Mr. Devey. I heard of the arrival at Erzeroum of Moussa Boy's accusers *en route* for the capital.

I am, &c.
(Signed) H. CHERMSIDE.

---

* No. 72.

Inclosure 2 in No. 75.

Vice-Consul Devey to Colonel Chermside.

Van, July 26, 1889.

Sir,

WITH reference to previous correspondence respecting Moussa Bey, you are doubtless aware that His Majesty the Sultan has issued an order, on Moussa Bey's complaining that he had been maligned, to the effect that sums of money should be paid by the Bitlis authorities to any persons desirous of prosecuting him at Constantinople, in order that they should be enabled to reach the capital.

I now hear that a large number of persons have taken advantage of this just measure, of whom several are Armenians and some Moslems.

In conjunction with this subject you may be interested to hear that the young daughter of Mouro, of Hartz village, in Mush Plain (mentioned in my despatch of the 27th April), who was carried off by night, and married, and placed in the house of a son of Moussa Bey, was lately brought into Court at Bitlis for the purpose of publishing her conversion to Islam. But it would seem she had completely deceived her new relations as to her intention of abjuring the Christian faith, and she at once, to the vexation of the Moslems assembled, declared she had been carried off by force, was and remained a Christian, and claimed to return to her mother's house. She was then restored to her relations.

A man named Basmajian Khatchmanoug, an ex-member of the Commercial Court, and said to have been of low character, has just been shot from the street by night in his own house in Bitlis. The murderers have not been arrested, and I am not aware of the motive of the crime.

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. P. DEVEY.

No. 76.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received August* 23.)

(No. 334.)

My Lord,

Therapia, August 17, 1889.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 285 of the 22nd ultimo, announcing the appointment of Raouf Pasha to be Governor of Bitlis, I have the honour to inclose a copy of a despatch from Her Majesty's Consul-General at Beyrout reporting the arrival of Raouf Pasha's successor, Aziz Pasha.

Mr. Eldridge criticizes rather severely the short tenure of office at Beyrout of Raouf Pasha, whom, however, Mr. Moore described as a just, liberal-minded, and enlightened Governor in his despatch of the 6th May, which was transmitted to your Lordship in my despatch No. 190 of the 24th May.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 76.

Consul-General Eldridge to Sir W. White.

Beyrout, July 30, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to report that the Governor-General of Beyrout, Raouf Pasha, was very suddenly dismissed from his post some ten days ago, and that his successor, Aziz Pasha, arrived at this place on Thursday last by the Mahsoussé Company's steamer from Constantinople. His Excellency has already won golden opinions from the native population by his courtesy and genial manners, and he appears to be a man of considerable ability and intelligence, and thus it seems probable that he will be a more efficient and successful Governor than the late Vali, whose short tenure of office was signalized by a pronounced inability to hold the balance between the Moslem and Christian population, and whose fanaticism rendered him singularly unfitted to hold a post where tact and moderation are the most requisite qualities.

Raouf Pasha has been appointed to the Vilayet of Bitlis, and will shortly proceed to Constantinople *en route* for his post.

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. JACKSON ELDRIDGE.

No. 77.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received September* 6.)

(No. 351.)

My Lord,

Therapia, August 30, 1889.

BEFORE the receipt of your Lordship's despatch No. 267 of the 14th instant, I had already inquired, by telegraph, of Mr. Boyadjian, British Vice-Consul at Diarbekir, as to what truth there was in the reports that at Diarbekir robberies were patronized by the Head of the Police, who was said to have organized a gang of robbers; that Kurds had strangled an Armenian named Kerook; that at Mardin manifestos were placarded calling upon Mahommedans to massacre infidels; that the Sultan had ordered the dissolution of Armenian commercial societies and confiscation of books, accounts, and money.

Mr. Boyadjian has now replied that he can almost positively state that the Sultan never has given such orders as these. As regards the other statements, he says that there is some truth in them, but they are either exaggerated or distorted, and states that he is sending a detailed Report by post, which I shall not fail to communicate to your Lordship when it reaches me.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

No. 78.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received September* 6.)

(No. 353. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Therapia, August 30, 1889.

EVER since the receipt by me of your Lordship's instructions dated the 29th May, 1889, on the subject of Moussa Bey, the Kurdish Chief, I have not ceased to urge by every proper means available to me the bringing to justice of that Chief of a powerful tribe, and not in the Turkish service, as has been alleged.

The first difficulty consisted in having him brought to Constantinople, and most well-informed persons doubted whether this would ever be accomplished. Still he is here, and there is every prospect now of his undergoing a regular trial.

The Sultan sent me a message on Friday, the 23rd instant, by one of his secretaries, that the Court was ready to hear his case as soon as witnesses came forward prepared to give evidence.

This was no easy matter, and I need not trouble your Lordship with details with regard to the obstacles that had to be overcome in this direction.

From the accompanying copy of a Report received by me from Her Majesty's Consul at Trebizond,* it appears that forty-seven witnesses, subjects of the Sultan, have arrived here, and I believe that they have been persuaded to come forward by the Government authorities, and under escort, and at the public expense.

So far I have no cause to complain of want of fair play, and there appears to be a reasonable prospect that the ends of justice will not be evaded, and that the fearful outrages of which this Chieftain is accused, and with details of which our press teems, will be properly sifted and examined in this capital.

I have likewise the honour to inclose a copy of a very obliging letter received by me from an eminent American clergyman here with regard to countrymen of his whose evidence is of great importance.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 78.

Consul Longworth to Sir W. White.

Trebizond, August 21, 1889.

Sir,

WITH reference to my despatch of the 20th June last, I beg here, in confirmation of my cyphered telegram of yesterday, to inform your Excellency that, in

* See Inclosure in No. 57.

answer to an invitation from the Porte, forty-seven persons from the Mush, Van, and Bitlis districts have left for Constantinople on board the British steamer "Tenedos," as plaintiffs and witnesses of Moussa Bey's misdeeds in Khurdistan.

I have, &c.
(Signed) H. Z. LONGWORTH.

Inclosure 2 in No. 78.

The Rev. H. Dwight to Sir W. White.

(Private.)
Bible House, Constantinople, August 29, 1889.

Sir,

REFERRING to your Excellency's question of yesterday, I would say that, aside from the Armenian Patriarchate, no one has yet seemed to be advising the Armenian complainants against Moussa Bey. An impression exists in the Armenian community that those who care for the favour of the Palace will not find active support of these complaints to be compatible with their own interests. Hence there seems to be a tendency at present to leave the villagers who have complaints to make them ostensibly under the sole guidance of the Patriarchate.

This dread of indirect injury to personal interests through identification with the complainants in this case appears to be shared by the legal profession, but I am told that the case for the prosecution will be in the hands of a well-known lawyer popularly known by the name of Tinghir.

It is reported among the people here that the Russian Consuls at Trebizond and Erzeroum have seen and sympathized with the forty-seven complainants who have just arrived, and have given gifts to some of them. For this story I am not able to vouch.

On behalf of the American Mission I have to-day written Mr. King, Chargé d'Affaires of the United States, asking him to inform the Porte that the complaint of Messrs. Knapp and Raynolds against Moussa Bey yet waits a hearing, and to request information concerning the steps which the Imperial Government proposes to take in the matter.

Very respectfully, &c.
(Signed) HENRY O. DWIGHT.

No. 79.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received September 20.)

(No. 370.)
Therapia, September 11, 1889.

My Lord,

WITH reference to my despatch No. 353 of the 30th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a despatch from Colonel Chermside, inclosing one from Mr. Devey, on the subject of the witnesses who have come here to appear against Moussa Bey, and also giving the conclusion of the story of the daughter of Mouro, reported in Mr. Devey's despatch No. 10 of the 27th April, inclosed in my despatch No. 197 of the 30th May.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 79.

Consul Chermside to Sir W. White.

Erzeroum, August 29, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Excellency two copies of Mr. Devey's despatch No. 27. In all, thirty-four persons have passed through Erzeroum *en route* to Constantinople as accusers of Moussa Bey. Mr. Devey has been misinformed as to Basmajian Khatchmanoug, who is alive, and has not been shot at. Another man, named Khatchmanoukion, was shot, but not injured.

I have, &c.
(Signed) HERBERT CHERMSIDE, *Colonel.*

Inclosure 2 in No. 79.

Vice-Consul Devey to Consul Chermside.

Sir,
Van, July 26, 1889.

WITH reference to previous correspondence respecting Moussa Bey, you are doubtless aware that His Majesty the Sultan has issued an order on Moussa Bey, complaining that he had been maligned, to the effect that sums of money should be paid by the Bitlis authorities to any persons desirous of prosecuting him at Constantinople, in order that they should be enabled to reach the capital. I now hear that a large number of persons have taken advantage of this just measure, of whom several are Armenian, and some Moslems.

In conjunction with this subject, you may be interested to hear that the young daughter of Mouro, of Hartz, a village in Moush Plain (mentioned in my despatch of the 27th April), who was carried off by night, and married, and placed in the house of a son of Moussa Bey, was lately brought into Court at Bitlis for the purpose of publishing her conversion to Islam. But it would seem she had completely deceived her new relations as to her intention of abjuring the Christian faith, and she at once, to the vexation of the Moslems assembled, declared she had been carried off by force, was, and remained, a Christian, and claimed to return to her mother's house. She was then restored to her relations.

A man named Basmajian Khatchmanoug, an ex-member of the Commercial Court, and said to have been of low character, has just been shot from the street by night in his own house in Bitlis. The murderers have not been apprehended, and I am not aware of the motive of the crime.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

No. 80.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received September 20.)

(No. 375.)
Therapia, September 14, 1889.

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Lordship a copy of a most valuable Report drawn up by Colonel Chermside on the subject of his journey to Van, Bitlis, and Moush, in which your Lordship will find a record of most instructive observations from the pen of that officer on the present condition of the districts traversed by him, and in which he states that "outrages by the Kurds on Christians, inter-tribal feuds, highway robbery, cattle lifting, all exist," and adds that "none appear to him as frequent and as wholesale as they were."

The testimony of Colonel Chermside is so dispassionate, and based on local knowledge both from his present residence and former visits, that I consider it a valuable contribution to our information concerning the districts inhabited by Armenians.

When upon this subject I may allude to a correspondence from here, dated the 9th instant, which appears in the "Times" of Tuesday, the 10th September, 1889, and I may be allowed to state that I have no knowledge of any sitting of a Special Council on the subject of Armenia; but that as regards the correspondent's supposition, that Italy had made any remonstrances on that question at Constantinople, I believe the writer is entirely mistaken.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 80.

Consul Chermside to Sir W. White.

Erzeroum, August 29, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to inform your Excellency that I have returned from a tour in Kurdistan from Erzeroum to Ardish on Lake Van, Berghiri, Serai, Van, Shattak, Mukus, Khizan, Bitlis, Moush, Ginj, and Erzeroum.

The quiet state of the country, and the relative security of the roads, as compared with my experiences eight to ten years ago, surprised me.

Small unarmed caravans, small groups of wayfarers, or single ones, are to be met with almost throughout the districts visited, with the exception of the recent outrages near Moush by Moussa Bey: the instances of such which I came across were very rare.

The number of crimes and outrages which have come to the knowledge of the Vice-Consuls in Kurdistan and myself during the past year show clearly how far less frequent outrages are than a few years since.

The agitation which commenced in Europe in the press concerning the oppression of Armenians is of far earlier date than the recent outrages of Moussa Bey, and from external, not internal sources.

I have no hesitation in saying that there are no special grounds or peculiarly aggravated state of affairs (with above exception) calling for it.

The state of affairs which evokes so much sympathy for the lot of Turkish Armenians in Kurdistan always exists.

It is unquestionable that the lot of a Christian Rayah, of whatever nationality, is not an enviable one.

The statements as to deliberate attempts to exterminate the Armenians, and wholesale recruiting of harems with kidnapped girls, are exaggerations so gross as to be ridiculous.

The virtual inequality of Christian and Moslem, the want of efficient protection to the former, and of vindication of violence towards him, exists as before; nor need I trouble your Excellency with a repetition of the many well-known shortcomings of Turkish administration.

Having had the honour to report on long journeys in Kurdistan in 1879-82, I may briefly point out to your Excellency the changes most noticeable.

The effects of the war and famine on public security have, to a great extent, disappeared.

On the other hand, the depression of trade and deterioration of the economical condition of the country have had a marked effect.

Inhabitants of all classes and religions are affected by this.

Outrages by the Kurds on Christians, inter-tribal feuds, highway robbery, cattle lifting, &c., all exist, but none appear to me to be nearly as frequent or as wholesale as they were.

As late as 1882, in many of the wildest districts of Kurdistan, there was little or no Government, the districts being nominally Nahiyyes (Communes) of large ill-defined Cazas (Cantons).

In the Bohtan and Hekkiari districts since my last visit, the seats of Government of a Kaïmakam have been more than doubled.* In each of these are a Governor with gendarmes, Courts of First Instance, a police official, and other machinery of Government.

I believe there is no remaining district in Kurdistan where taxes are not rendered, although the proportion collected in some are ridiculously small.

Prior to the abolition of the feudal system by the enactment of the "Tanzimat," the Rayahs received considerable protection from the Beys and Aghas to whom they were subject. On the power of the latter being broken, and the substitution for it of a weak, often nominal, local Government, the Rayahs suffered much from the violence and oppression of their Kurdish neighbours. At the same time, the descendants of the Beys and Aghas in many localities still exacted from the Rayahs contributions and forced labour, and maintained other ancient customs for which they gave no just equivalent. Remnants of feudality linger to the present day in Hekkiari, Bohtan, and a great part of the Bitlis Vilayet, the villages paying to the Aghas taxes termed "Kabal."

In some places in return for this the Aghas appoint responsible armed Moslem Guards to protect the villages and property, but the villagers can equally well subscribe for this themselves, as is done in Albania and also in parts of Kurdistan and Asia Minor.

The contributions demanded by the Aghas are in no wise recognized by the Government, but the latter is, of course, perfectly aware of their existence.

In Erzeroum the custom is obsolete, and in the districts visited chiefly calls for

*Chal Brit-esh-Sheheb, Deyr Gul, Eyrah, and Berwar, are new Governments, and I believe there are two or three more.

remark in Bitlis Vilayet, where in the Cazas of Khizan, Shirvan, Modikan, Sassun, Koulp, and Schin, and in the Sandjak of Genj, the Christians pay these double taxes.

Former Reports of Major Clayton and Colonel Everett describe the very abject condition of the inhabitants of many Christian hamlets and villages; this still exists (Major Clayton No. 33, 18th August, 1881, Colonel Everett, 30th January, 1885, No. 19, Confidential, Asiatic Reforms).

As pointed out above, the local government has now become through large wild mountainous tracts a greater reality than it was. Perhaps the most important measure of control in effect to which the Kurds have been subjected is that of furnishing conscripts to the army.

From all districts apparently, however remote, men are furnished, and all question of open resistance is quite at an end, or in abeyance.

It is true that in many districts a majority avoid the obligation by flight and hiding. Out of thirty men called for, perhaps ten or six only are actually produced.

The great scourge of the settled population of the mountainous districts of Kurdistan, between Van and the Tigris and south of the Eastern Euphrates is the "Kocher," or Nomad Kurdish population. Since the removal of the Begs, the Kochers have invaded districts formerly free from them.

This and the decline of the weaving industry have contributed to depopulate whole mountain districts. The Christians generally remove to the towns.

The Nomad question has not been seriously taken up by the Turks, although by establishing some of them in winter quarters south of Ameydieh, a greater hold has been gained over them. The Kochers' own experience of the famine has also led to many having Settlements, in some cases summer Settlements only. This question remains much as described in Colonel Everett's Report of the 30th January, 1885, and it affects the settled Moslem population almost as seriously as the Christians.

The military detachments have been very much increased in number in Kurdistan of late years.

At Guveyr (or Govver), in Hekkiari, is a garrison with a telegraph to Bashkaleh. At Julamerik is a garrison with a telegraph to Bashkaleh; both these garrisons furnish detachments in out districts in summer. At Chal is a detachment. At Serai there is a barrack; and there is a company at Akhwrek, another detachment near, and a detachment at Razi.

During the present summer, very numerous detachments have been sent out to maintain order.

In the Melasgird district I found cavalry patrols; at Ardish a cavalry detachment. In the Abagha plain, a squadron; near Berghiri, half-a-company of infantry. To Hekkiari two whole battalions had been dispatched to be dispersed in detachments. Some of these were in Nurduz, where the Christians are in a majority. In Shattakh was half-a-battalion, and a detachment was on the point of proceeding south-west to the district of some unruly Kurds. In the Modikan district of Bitlis, often very unruly, there is a whole battalion.

It is freely asserted that, since the Berlin Treaty, Turkey has done nothing to improve matters in her Asiatic provinces.

The limiting of the power of the Executive, the introduction of the new system of Tribunals of Justice, were very comprehensive and expensive measures. Their failure for want of good instruments for execution and for other reasons is notorious, and fully dealt with in numerous Consular Reports.

What is perhaps the crux of the question as regards the Armenians is, that efficient protection is not extended to individuals, neither are their rights vindicated, nor their equality anything but a name.

With a weak Moslem Government this is only to be expected, and even in the towns the different status of Christian and Moslem is very noticeable.

The policy of the present reign has been consistently to develop the Moslem feelings of self-reliance, and to bring home to Moslems the expediency of being a self-supporting community.

Thus Moslems are trained as engineers, doctors, and in the professions of various other Departments, and in these branches are gradually replacing the native or alien Christian employés.

The fostering of the exclusive spirit of Islam combined with the great jealousy of Moslems at the material prosperity of such a large number of their Christian fellow-subjects have stimulated that bitter feeling against Christians which so strongly pervades the Moslems throughout the Empire, more noticeably so, indeed, in other districts than Kurdistan.

Feelings of Armenians.—It is often asserted that, owing to the toleration of Turkey as regards language, religions, &c., the Armenians are by no means disaffected, and only anxious for security, tranquillity, and the real recognition of their rights as citizens. This view is rather that of those educated Armenians, dwellers in towns, who are aware of the advantages which they enjoy in Turkey.

As education develops the Armenians, who look to the Western nations as their model, become more and more discontented with the Oriental civilization in which they find themselves. The uneducated classes are merely loyal as far as influenced by the educated. The old race and religious antipathy to Kurd and Moslem exists. Their sympathies are with any Christian Power as against the Turk. The educated, from their habits of intrigue and mutual jealousies, are as incompetent as ever to combine, and the poorer classes have no power, being rarely armed, and being surrounded by a majority of the hostile and dominant religion.

The Turks, however, are quite correct, in my opinion, in considering them disaffected.

The formation a few years since of Secret Societies and Committees near Erzeroum and in other districts, the proposals and attempts to procure arms, the occurrences of recent years at and near Van, all indicate the true sentiments of disaffection.

It would indeed be strange were it otherwise.

Armenians frequently tell me that I hear of few genuine outrages, because the villagers fear to come forward and tell the truth as to those committed on them.

I find, on the contrary, that townspeople and villagers have no hesitation in addressing the Consul of a friendly Power as if their own Government were the mutual and natural enemy of both, and seem surprised at such language being discouraged.

The Turkish Government and its Representatives, however, seem to consider Armenian disaffection in too serious a light, and the harassing action described in the despatches of Mr. Devey from Van is neither dignified nor judicious.

In Europe, however, I believe that a state of affairs as regards the number of political prisoners—very different to the reality—is believed to exist. In June, to the best of my knowledge, there were no Armenian political prisoners at Trebizond or at Erzeroum; at Kharput and Diarbekir together two (sent to Erzeroum) or three; at Van eleven; and none, to the best of my belief, at Bitlis, Moush, Erzingian, Egui, Arabkir, &c.

The Kurds.—In the course of an extended tour, I only came across two Kurdish functionaries of the Executive branch of Government.

It seems a matter of regret for political reasons that the Turks do not pay more attention to the Kurds. They are a strong, warlike, hardy race, and, in the time of their Begs, mosques, medressehs, schools, bridges, &c., existed in many districts where such evidences of civilization now only remain as ruins.

The descendants of the Begs are, as a rule, illiterate, and lead idle, purposeless lives, occupied in their tribal and family quarrels, and exacting all they can from their own clansmen and the Christian Rayahs.

Very few are decorated or made much of, or employed in the executive functions of the Government, nor are they fit for such employ. It would, however, seem well worth the while of the Turks to educate the rising generation, and employ them in the civil and military administration in Kurdistan.

The Kurds show the greatest loyalty and unreasoning fidelity to their natural leaders.

Time and money are the two great requisites for the gradual improvement of the country. With time considerable advance has been made as regards security, and enforcing some measure of respect to authority. Again, involved and unsatisfactory as is the financial condition of Turkey, much money has been spent in the last ten years in extending and developing the civil administration and the military organization in Kurdistan.

Bitlis, as pointed out in Reports of my predecessors, is still the worst-governed district. It has now been raised to the rank of second-class vilayet,* which will obviate the Appeal Courts being at Van, and also allow men of higher rank and reputation to be sent as Valis.

Réouf Pasha, late Vali of Beyrout, is on his way to Bitlis, to replace Edhem Pasha. Now that the latter is superseded, Moslems in Bitlis did not hesitate to say that he had bartered his independence for bribes.

* Rumoured that it is to be first-class.

No. 80*.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.

(No. 83.)
(Telegraphic.) *Foreign Office, September 25, 1889, 3·50 P.M.*

MACMILLAN'S family propose to stimulate activity of Porte by letter to the "Times" commenting on the incident as illustrating state of public safety in Turkey, but are willing to be guided in the matter by advice.

What is your opinion as to expediency of such a course?

Imperial Commissioners have been sent to Van to inquire into the administration there.

In conclusion, I may quote a paragraph from a Report of Lieutenant-Colonel Everett, written after a very similar tour through Kurdistan in 1884. After studying "some of the older Reports, I have been compelled to conclude that, although these particular provinces are still far removed from that condition of things which forms the basis of prosperity, yet a decided progress has been made, not, on the whole, discreditable to the Porte, considering the very short time that has elapsed since the districts were barbarous feudal States." These words apply with equal force to 1889.

I have, &c.
(Signed) HERBERT CHERMSIDE, *Colonel.*

No. 81.

Consul Chermside to Foreign Office.—(Received September 27.)

(Extract.) *Erzeroum, September 12, 1889.*

I HAVE sent in my report on my tour. I am quite astonished to find how quiet the country is; the seats of Government and the stations of troops have been enormously increased since I was in Kurdistan last. With the exception of the outrage in Tiari last year (Nestorian district), which has appeared in the Blue Book, and Moussa Bey's principal recent outrages, four in number, there is hardly anything to report. Vice-Consul Devey has just been through Bohtan and Hakkiari, and reports the Kurds "like lambs," and "hastening to pay their taxes." He, I, and Boyadjian (at Kharput and Diarbekir) all agree that outrages, though of the same nature as from time immemorial, are much less frequent than they were.

Fitzgerald, of the "Standard," has been here. His experience of Kurdistan is limited to Erzeroum, which is not in it. He has also been publishing alarmist telegrams about the concentration of Russian troops. The facts are that there are no extra troops in Trans-Caucasia, but the 38th and 39th Divisions and their artillery have been assembled for manœuvres, and also a cavalry division. The troops appear now to be dispersing.

The war preparations in roads, &c., *i.e.*, Kars to Olti, begun and reported upon last year, go on, and are being pushed forward with vigour, as they have been for the last four years. Much is also being done to complete the remodelled fortifications on the western heights of Kars, two main works; this is also the same as last year.

I inclose extracts of letters from Devey and Boyadjian, himself an Armenian, which quite bear out my views, in opposition to those of Armenians in Europe and newspaper correspondents.

Inclosure 1 in No. 81.

Vice-Consul Devey to Consul Chermside.

(Extract.) *August 29, 1889.*

ON the road I came up with Major Hilmi's battalion collecting taxes and keeping order. The three great Hartushi Aghas are Zindi Agha, Abdi, and Mehmed (brother of Haji Agha, detained this season at Mosoul). The Kurds are quiet as lambs, and hastening to pay their taxes and throw themselves at the feet of the Government represented by the Major and the troops; they are awfully afraid of the soldiers since last year's business. I hear of only one affair, viz., Geydan [? Goyyan] Kurds from Gulasinda had come up and looted Mamkoran at twelve hours' distance; Mamkoran lies about three hours north of Elk, and is west of Farashin. Also two or three of Tayib Agha's men, being at Haji Agha's camp, had lately picked a quarrel, and hanjiars been used, but the soldiers were there at the moment, so there was no talk of revenge. The Mamkoran affair had taken place before the soldiers were sent. The Nordouz Kaïmakam said he had squared a trifling Yaila dispute; somebody sold some Agha the right to pasture, and they ate 150 prs. of grass; but the seller had no title, so the Kaïmakam had restitution made, and 150 prs. was paid to the rightful owners.

The Van Cazas seemed to me much quieter and better governed than I had expected, and the wholesome check of the troops among the Hartushi is a great

blessing. Merzu Bey (Haideranli of Diadin), Derbaz Agha, and Hamzo, of notoriety, have been summoned here, it is said by Vali, and that their past offences are to be overlooked on condition of their giving evidence against Temir Oglous.

Inclosure 2 in No. 81.

Mr. Boyadjian to Consul Chermside.

July 27, 1889.

(Extract.)

IN one of my private letters I stated that one of the "tabours" stationed in this place was sent by the especial orders of His Majesty the Sultan to Nerib for the purpose of forcing the people to deliver the criminals of Hani, whom they were sheltering. It appears that the object was thus far accomplished, as I am informed that all the miscreants but one have been arrested, and are now in the hands of the Diarbekir authorities.

Inclosure 3 in No. 81.

Mr. Boyadjian to Consul Chermside.

August 10, 1889.

(Extract.)

I CAN positively state that, under the strong administration of the late and present Valis, the numbers of such outrages have decidedly decreased. You will gather that in the great majority of the outrages the victims were Moslem Kurds, and the statements of the papers referred to in your letter that they were solely directed against Armenians, and having for aim their extermination, are, as far as it concerns the Diarbekir and Kharput Vilayets, mostly exaggerated.

The affair of Blaidar, in Bisheri Nahia, in which seven persons were murdered, and fifty houses burnt down, arose from a long-standing antagonism between two Armenian Chiefs of the village. One of the parties, together with his brother, a priest, has become Roman Catholic, hoping, through the influence of his co-religionists in Diarbekir, to overthrow his opponent. Failing in this, he went one night to a powerful Chief of a neighbouring Kurdish village, and induced him to make a raid upon his village, and exterminate the family in question, promising him a rich plunder. I am informed that his brother, the priest, had a finger in this plot. Next morning the Kurdish Chief, according to the previous arrangement, with many followers attacked Blaidar, murdered five people, three of whom were children of tender age.

The village was sacked and the houses set on fire; one of the children, six years of age, in his terror ran out and hid himself under some dry twigs heaped near the house. The brother of the priest, the principal actor, standing on the housetop and seeing this, called upon the Kurds to finish that child also, and the child was butchered there and then. Fortunately, the man against whom all these were directed was absent that night, and thus escaped being murdered.

Another Kurdish Chief, on being informed of the fact, started with many followers for Blaidar to assist and protect the victims. On arriving there a fight ensued between the Kurds, and in the affray two men fell and a few more received wounds.

On being informed of the affair, the Vali took effectual measures for the apprehension of the miscreants, and within a short space of time all were arrested, including the priest and his brother.

From the above statement you will undoubtedly gather that the case, though a horrible outrage, cannot be cited as one directed by Kurds against Armenians, as the principal actor was an Armenian himself.

The affair of Haini. A few very violent and fanatic Kurds, the sons of a certain Sheikh of the place, have been habitually and frequently committing violence against the Armenians of the place, such as assaulting, insulting, violating by force the women, desecrating the church, and once rushing upon the Protestant pastor of the place knife in hand to stab him, the local authorities being either unwilling or unable to lay hands on them. The Armenians finding it intolerable to live there, more than a hundred of them repaired to Diarbeker in order to lay before the Vali their grievances.

Surri Pasha, the ex-Governor-General, dispatched at once some gendarmes with the orders to arrest the offenders, but on their arrival at Haini an Armenian was murdered by a Kurd in the open daytime. The assassin, together with the other criminals, escaped to the mountains. When the new Vali arrived I took an early opportunity of calling his attention to the state of things in Haini, and pressed him for

an effectual measure; upon which his Excellency addressed a telegram to Constantinople for permission to employ two companies of regular soldiers against the Nerib Kurds who were sheltering the criminals.

His Majesty the Sultan, having been informed of the case, ordered that a "tabour" (battalion) should be dispatched to the spot, and the result was that all the criminals were within a short time arrested, and they are lodged now in the Diarbekir prison awaiting their trial.

Few cases of murder and rapine came to my knowledge during the present year. The Zemkian Kurds have committed a good many outrages upon each other.

I have, however, the satisfaction to inform you that through the strong and honest administration of Haji Hassan Bey almost all the principal bad characters in the Diarbekir Vilayet have lately been arrested, and the prisons of Mardin and Diarbekir are full now. It is hoped that the province may be hereafter tranquillized, provided they receive their deserved punishment, and that depends upon the uprightness of the Criminal Courts, which the experience of past years does not lead us to hope for.

It may perhaps be within the truth to state that the feelings of Mahommedans in general are not so friendly towards Armenians as some years ago, and they sometimes evince their dislike, but it is impossible to subdue such feelings by any but moral means.

No. 82.

Sir W. White to Sir T. Sanderson.—(Received September 30.)

(Private.)

My dear Sanderson, *Therapia, September* 25, 1889.

INCLOSED a private letter from Chermside of the 14th, which, I think, has sufficient interest for you to be forwarded privately at once by post (English closed mail), and a request to let me have it back.

The inclosures can be kept at the Office if this is considered necessary.

Yours, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

P.S.—Mr. Fitzgerald, of the "Standard," who has been with me a long time this morning, and who comes from Tiflis and the Caucasus, and has been sending alarmist telegrams to his paper, still maintains his statements as to Russian preparations for a rush on Asiatic Turkey.

I was glad to have Colonel Chermside's sober views and his facts to attenuate those of Mr. Fitzgerald.

W. A. W.

Inclosure 1 in No. 82.

Consul Chermside to Sir W. White.

(Extract.) *Erzeroum, September* 14, 1889.

I, IN common with other Consuls and people, missed the post last week, the authorities having forgotten the courtesy of informing us of a change in the day.

I inclose a Memorandum from Mr. Dovey *à propos* of a statement printed in the recent Blue Book concerning his visit to Bitlis. In my own case, I declined to be the guest of any one, and the Armenians, whose seditious talk I did not relish, and who openly told me that, as the English acknowledged the Cross, I ought to look on the Turks as enemies, have been much exercised at my reserve, and written to their friends to complain. Your Excellency will have gathered from my Report on my late tour how generally quiet the country is, although the same causes that have always produced trouble remain (as, in my opinion, and, indeed, in that of all dwelling in the East, they always will remain). Mr. Dovey's letter to me concerning his recent journey, of which I inclose an extract in an official despatch, incidentally quite confirms my conclusions. I inclose herewith, for your Excellency's information, extracts of letters from Mr. Boyadjian, himself an Armenian, which bear out the same views. I hardly know how far in official communications it may be the province of Consuls to notice utterances in Parliament, but Mr. Bryce's description of the wholesale Kurdish outrage on Bledar is very far from being borne out by the facts I have already reported to your

Excellency, of which Mr. Boyadjian's letter treats *in extenso*. I would also point out that the "Hainsdan," and such papers, though eager to seize upon every lawless act against Christians, while ignoring those against Moslems—certainly none the less frequent—almost, if not quite, invariably omit to mention whether such acts are punished by the Government, and due vindication of the victims' rights made. The Hani instance of effective action on the part of the Government is only one of many that have come to my notice recently. A haul of over forty highway robbers was recen tly made in this district.

One day, some 50 miles from Van, Mr. Devey and I met an Armenian acquaintance of his with no companions or escort; he had some hundreds of pounds—800*l.*, I think—on his person, and told us it was the third time in ten days he had traversed the route on business.

* * * * * *

Ohannes Mardeghian, a photographer, sent here as a political prisoner from Kharput with two others, died this week in prison of typhoid fever.

Inclosure 2 in No. 82.

Memorandum in respect of certain Insinuations made in a "Pro-memorid" received from the Porte, which forms the inclosure in Sir W. White's despatch No. 89 in White Book "Turkey No. 1 (1889)."

(Confidential.)

PARAGRAPH 4. Beginning: "Les informations," &c.

The suggestion is that whilst staying in the house of Avedis Effendi Khachmanoughian, of Bitlis, I obtained certain information, especially in regard to Moussa Bey, through my host, and that Avedis Effendi is inclined to sedition and a malcontent; and that, therefore, my information must be considered neither accurate nor trustworthy.

I deny both points absolutely.

In the first place, vague reports of Moussa Bey's crimes and of his having burnt Armenians alive had been current at Van, and it was one of the objects of my visit to Bitlis to learn how far they were true. When I reached Bitlis, Moussa Bey's escape was the topic of the day; it was the chief subject of conversations I had with the Defterdar, the Cadi, the American missionaries, several functionaries of high and low grade, and one or two Armenian inhabitants. In my interviews with the Vali the subject was not mentioned. The Moslems generally spoke of Moussa Bey as being persecuted and calumniated, and the victim of certain mysterious parties, of whom I could learn nothing precise. Whilst on a visit to Ibrahim Bey, of the Temiz Court of Constantinople, who had lately been inspecting the Van Tribunals and was on the same business at Bitlis, one or two judicial officers were present with one or two other persons, and I think it was either the President or one of the members of the Court of First Instance began speaking of the disturbed state of the Mush plain, "but that doubtless a person of such high rank as Ibrahim Bey would have no trouble in reaching Mush; very likely Moussa Bey would come to offer explanations and ask his protection and favour." When Ibrahim Bey said, "The ruffian; I will have nothing to do with him. Why does he burn innocent people and commit atrocities?" the reply was that he had not been proved guilty of burning; he was not so black as he was painted, had done the Government good service, &c., in the style of the apology afterwards published in the "Bitlis Gazette" (*vide* Inclosure in my despatch No. 15 to Colonel Chermside). This was the only open reference to Moussa Bey's barbarity that I heard from a Moslem at Bitlis evidently believing in his guilt, and not afraid to own it. As to Avedis Effendi's share in affording any information, this was infinitesimal. I went to Bitlis prepared to find in Avedis Effendi a sycophant and tool only too willing to lend himself to the basest purposes of a corrupt Government, a usurer and oppressor of his fellows in the tithe farming, &c., and of generally immoral and low character, and was agreeably undeceived on making his acquaintance. When, therefore, I found that I was to lodge in apartments belonging to Avedis Effendi, I entered the house with a feeling of decided distrust; afterwards when I ventured to address to him a question or two on the state of the country, he displayed such painful unwillingness and reticence in replying, that I at once decided to make my inquiries elsewhere, and left him at peace.

On returning to Van I found Moussa Bey's misdeeds were the talk of the town. Towards the end of the month of May, I heard the Vali of Van one evening at the house of the Defterdar express in the strongest terms most severe strictures on the mis-government of the adjoining vilayet in referring to the crimes of Moussa Bey. Differences of opinion existing between the Valis of Van and of Bitlis, Khalil Pasha might have been prejudiced against Edhem Pasha, to whom he imputed corrupt practices. But, besides myself, the Defterdar, the Cadi, the Mufti, the President of the Appeal Court, the Commandant, and other officers and functionaries, who were present, had all heard of these notorious outrages and robberies. The newly arrived Cadi, who had just passed Molazgerd near Mush, spoke of the disturbed state of these regions; and the Mufti (of Khlat in Bitlis) related stories of Moussa Bey's father, Mirza Bey, who had *burnt a whole village* thirty years ago, when eighty persons perished in the flames (the *pro-memorid* says that burning living bodies is against the Moslem religion, and the present charge could not possibly be true), in consequence of which he had been exiled to Constantinople for ten years; he also mentioned the jealousy and hate between Mirza Bey and Haji Nejmeddin. The above facts will show that Moussa Bey's evil deeds were no less notorious among Moslems than among Christians.

A bad note is put against the name of Khoven Vartabed, the Armenian Vicar at Bitlis. He is also said to have been among the complainants. From what I heard of this ecclesiastic, who is of very superior education, having a profound knowledge of Arabic, besides speaking English and French, he was unpopular among the Armenians on account of his being of the older school of Armenians, who endeavour to make the best of existing conditions, and to induce individuals to bear with patience such evils as they may be from time to time subjected to without obtaining proper redress. In consequence, his opinions being unknown or misunderstood, he was looked upon by some as a careless shepherd. In two interviews I had with him he deprecated the outcry raised abroad and the exaggerated stories published. Though he was aware of Moussa Bey's misdeeds, he did not consider the general condition so hopeless; he referred to the times of a past generation when there was no foreign intervention, no oceans of press pity poured out on the Armenians of Turkey, and when still their forefathers managed to live under Turkish rule pretty happily. He observed that he had lately been travelling in the Yezid districts and villages of Bitlis, whose condition he characterized as utterly miserable, whilst, unlike the Armenians, they had not priests and Bishops and a Patriarch, but no resource whatever to make their grievances known to the authorities. Their condition was truly desperate and heart-rending as compared with that of the Armenians.

Khoren Vartabed was shortly afterwards compelled by force, as the *pro-memorid* states, to sign a Mazbata complaining of Moussa Bey's crimes. A similar incident, by the way, occurred here; a priest of standing was inveigled into the house of a highly respectable family under the pretence of administering holy unction to a dying man, and then threatened morally and physically if he did not add his signature to the Van Petition of the 8th June (Inclosure 1 in No. 90), but he persisted in refusal.

Lastly, Avedis Effendi is accused of having tried to introduce into the country the seditious paper "Hainsdan." On visiting Bitlis, I gathered from a variety of trustworthy sources (including police agents) that no seditious feeling nor papers were to be met with at Bitlis; a surveillance of the post office had been instituted, however, within the last few days, because it was heard that the Armenians were proposing to forward a formal complaint respecting Moussa Bey.

I may mention that when I went to Bitlis I knew next to nothing of Avedis Effendi. If the authorities suspected him of sedition why his house should have been selected by them out of the 3,000 houses of Bitlis for me to lodge at I cannot understand.

(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY,
Her Britannic Majesty's Vice-Consul for Van.

Van, September 3, 1889.

Inclosure 3 in No. 82.

Mr. Boyadjian to Consul Chermside, July 27 *and August* 10, 1889.

[See Inclosures 2 and 3 in No. 81.]

No. 83.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received October 4.*)

(No. 387.)
Therapia, September 23, 1889.

My Lord,

WITH reference to your Lordship's despatch No. 267 of the 14th August, and to my despatch No. 351 of the 30th August, I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a despatch I have now received from Mr. Boyadjian, the British Vice-Consul at Diarbekir, giving a full report on the outrages alleged to have taken place at Diarbekir and Mardin on the subject of which Mr. Summers asked a question in the House of Commons.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 83.

Acting Vice-Consul Boyadjian to Sir W. White.

Kharpoot, September 9, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to inclose copy of my telegram of the 28th ultimo in reply to that of your Excellency, dated the 19th August, and beg now to submit respectfully the following remarks upon the subjects contained therein:—

1. The Head of the Police, who has been reported to your Excellency as patronizing robberies and organizing gangs of robbers, arrived at Diarbekir only four months ago, and it would be almost impossible to organize such gangs in so short a space of time. The report may have reference to the Head of Gendarmerie, who has been in that office the last twelve years or so; he is a Circassian, a very brave and active officer. Robberies have been occasionally committed by small bands of men of the same nationality, and he has been, rightly or wrongly, suspected of patronizing them, but nothing, to my knowledge, has been brought forward as a fact to support this suspicion.

2. With reference to an Armenian boy being strangled by the Kurds, I obtained the following particulars. A man named Keikor (not Kenhoe) was going lately from Egil—a small town to the north-west of Diarbekir—to a village, having with him a few yards of calico. On his way he was accosted by two or three Kurds, who, for the purpose of plunder, fell upon him and struck him on the head with a heavy club, making him insensible. After a time the man partially returned to consciousness, but from the effect of the severe blow he was unable to move, and the next day he narrated his story to an Armenian who was passing by, begging him to communicate the circumstances to his family, but the man, fearing the consequences of revealing the horrible deed, kept silence; on the third day a Moslem also happened to pass by that way, and was likewise implored to inform his relations, and tell them to come to his succour. This latter did, however, as he was requested, upon which his people hastened to the spot of the tragedy only to find that the poor man was already dead. On being informed of this cruel deed, his Excellency the Governor-General at once ordered the Major of Gendarmerie to repair with a sufficient force to Egil for the apprehension of the culprits, and, according to the latest advices, they have been arrested, together with twenty-seven other bad characters in that region.

3. As to the report that in Mardin manifestos were placed calling upon the Mahommedans to massacre the infidels, I have to state that in December or January last a mob composed of Mishkialis, a class of people of bad repute, assembled in front of the house of a Syrian Christian, who, I am assured, has no better name than his assailants: pistols were fired from without and within the house, but nothing, as I believe, of a serious nature occurred. After some hesitation, the police succeeded in dispersing the mob and arresting some of the ringleaders, as well as the Syrian. It was then reported that the movement had for its object the massacre of the Christians, but, on a more careful inquiry, I was convinced that that was not the case, and that the affair was simply a personal matter, resulting from a long-standing quarrel between the parties. But, while in Diarbekir, I heard a rumour that there was lately another disturbance, and as I could not obtain any reliable information concerning it, I have addressed a letter to one of the Armenian missionaries residing in Mardin, requesting him to furnish me with a correct and detailed account if there existed any

foundation for the rumour. Should I receive information of any importance, I shall not fail to communicate the same to your Excellency.

4. But in regard to the last point in your Excellency's telegraphic despatch, I have to repeat what I stated in my telegram, that, as far as I could ascertain, I am perfectly satisfied that no orders have been given by higher authorities to the Governors-General to dissolve Armenian commercial Societies and confiscate books, money, &c. I am aware of the existence of an order issued in 1886, and probably repeated since, calling the attention of the Governors-General to the revolutionary and seditious Committees formed by Armenians, and authorizing them to dissolve such at once, if existing in their respective provinces, and punish those who attempt to promote them, and I submit it as my private opinion that the said order may also have reference to such revolutionary Committees as may be formed under the name of commercial Societies.

5. I may, with your Excellency's permission, add that the state of things in the vilayet, bad as it is, yet, on the whole, crimes, such as murders and robberies, are, owing to the energy and integrity of the Governor-General, Hadji Hassan Bey, on the decrease. He has not been in Diarbekir more than four months, yet, in this short space of time, he has caused the arrest of more than 100 desperados who have been committing depredations of every kind for the last ten years, and his Excellency's vigorous measures make him deserving of the special approbation of the Sublime Porte.

I have, &c.
(Signed) THOMAS BOYADJIAN.

No. 84.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received October 4.*)

(No. 402.)
Therapia, September 30, 1889.

My Lord,

IN your despatch No. 220 of the 1st July, your Lordship forwarded to me a copy of a letter from Mr. Hagopian, complaining that some members of an Armenian deputation which had recently waited on the Grand Vizier to present a Petition on behalf of the inhabitants of Moush had been arrested by his Highness' orders, and I caused inquiries to be made on the subject by Mr. Marinitsch, who reported that there was no truth in the story. Of this I informed your Lordship in my despatch No. 276, Confidential, of the 17th July.

I noticed, however, in the "Times" of the 12th September, that Mr. Hagopian, in a letter addressed to the Editor, maintains the accuracy of his previous statement. I instructed Mr. Marinitsch again to make inquiries, and from his Memorandum, copy of which is herewith inclosed, your Lordship will perceive that Mr. Hagopian's statements would appear to be unfounded.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 84.

Memorandum by Mr. Marinitsch.

(Confidential.)

I HAVE seen with some surprise, in the "Times" of the 12th September, a letter headed "The Armenian Question," addressed to its Editor by Mr. G. Hagopian, maintaining that the news of the imprisonment was true.

In answer to Mr. Hagopian's letter, I can, after careful inquiries and information obtained from most authentic and non-Turkish sources, confirm my previous statement on this matter.

1. The leaders (about twelve persons) among those who made a demonstration and shouted before the Grand Vizier were not imprisoned. They were simply requested to step into the waiting-room, where they remained for about two hours, in order to allow the Grand Vizier to ascertain from them what was the object of the demonstration. This can in no way be called an imprisonment, and because all the Dragomans and other persons, and sometimes heads of foreign Missions calling upon the Grand Vizier, have to wait some time before being received by his Highness, who is always very busy.

The statement that those twelve persons who presented a Petition to the Grand Vizier remained in prison for about six days is therefore altogether unfounded.

2. Further, the ten persons who presented a Petition to His Imperial Majesty the Sultan were not imprisoned for a night and liberated the following day.

They were simply taken into the waiting-rooms in the Imperial Palace, where they were questioned; but, as they appeared late in the evening at the Palace, they had to wait a few hours until the necessary information was obtained from them. They were treated with due consideration. No prison exists at the Palace, and if they remained there a little longer this is due to the fact that the interrogatory took some time, and had to be communicated to His Imperial Majesty, who was, in fact, very anxious to know what these people wanted.

(Signed) H. MARINITSCH.

Pera, September 28, 1889.

No. 85.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received October* 4.)

(No. 405.)
My Lord, *Therapia, September* 30, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a despatch from Colonel Chermside, inclosing extracts from a letter from Mr. Vice-Consul Dovey on the subject of a journey recently undertaken by him in the Bohtan and Hekkiari districts.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 85.

Consul Chermside to Sir W. White.

Erzeroum, September 9, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to inform your Excellency that Mr. Dovey, being desirous of making a tour in his district at his own expense, I granted him the permission which as Consul I am entitled to give. I further suggested the route to follow as one of topographical interest, and also one which would enable him to give information as to the state of affairs in some of the remotest and least known districts of Kurdistan.

Mr. Dovey has completed a very interesting journey in Bohtan and Hekkiari. We separated in the Khizan Caza of the Bitlis Vilayet, and like myself he avoided, in accordance with instructions received by me from your Excellency, districts inhabited by Nestorians.

I have the honour to inclose an extract from a private letter of Mr. Dovey's, dated the 29th August.

This extract completely bears out the opinion formed by myself as to the state of the country, and the attitude of the Kurds towards the Government, as reported in my despatch of the 29th August. With the exception above mentioned, the greater part of the vilayets of Erzeroum, Van, and Bitlis, including many of the most remote mountain districts, have been recently visited by Mr. Dovey or myself.

M. Hippius, a military man, Russian Vice-Consul at Riza, and possible successor to M. Kolubakin at Van, has recently passed through Van; he proceeded thence to Bitlis, and it seems probable that he will continue his journey to Sert and Diarbekir.

Reouf Pasha, the new Governor-General of Bitlis Vilayet, left Erzeroum to-day. Being well acquainted with his son, Javdet Beg, I have been enabled to communicate to his Excellency the information as to Bitlis Vilayet given in my No. 29 and other details.

I have, &c.
(Signed) HERBERT CHERMSIDE.

Inclosure 2 in No. 85.

Vice-Consul Dovey to Consul Chermside.

(Extract.) *August* 29, 1889.

ON the road I came up with Major Hilmi's battalion collecting taxes and keeping order. The three great Hartoushi Aghas are Zindi Agha, Abdi, and Mehmed (brother of Haji Agha, detained this season at Mosoul). The Kurds are quiet as lambs, and hastening to pay their taxes and throw themselves at the feet of the Government represented by the Major and the troops. They are awfully afraid of the soldiers since last year's business. I heard of only one affair, viz., Govdan (? Goyyan) Kurds from Gulasinda had come up and looted Mamkoran at twelve hours' distance; Mamkoran lies about three hours north of Elk, and is west of Parashin. Also, two or three of Tayib Agha's men being at Haji Agha's camp had lately picked a quarrel and "hanjiars" been used, but the soldiers were there at the moment, so there was no talk of revenge.

The Mamkoran affair had taken place before the soldiers were sent. The Nordouz Kaïmakam said he had squared a trifling "yaila" dispute. Somebody sold some Agha the right to pasture, and they ate 150 pres. of grass; but the seller had no title, so the Kaïmakam had restitution made, and 150 pres. was paid to the rightful owners.

The Van Cazas seemed to me much quieter and better governed than I had expected, and the wholesome check of the troops among the Hartoushi is a great blessing.

Mirza Bey (Haideranli, of Diadin), Derbaz Agha, and Hamzo, of notoriety, have been summoned here, it is said by Vali, and that their past offences are to be overlooked on condition of their giving evidence against Temir Oglou.

No. 86.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir A. Paget.

(No. 173. Confidential.)
Sir, *Foreign Office, October* 17, 1889.

THE Austro-Hungarian Chargé d'Affaires called at this Office on the 7th instant, and stated that his Government had heard that considerable agitation existed among the Armenians within the Russian frontier, which accounted for the Russians not raising any question as to the reports of Turkish oppression of the Armenians in Kurdistan.

I am, &c.
(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 87.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received October* 18.)

(No. 409.)
My Lord, *Therapia, October* 4, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a despatch addressed by Mr. Dovey to Colonel Chermside, reporting on the action of certain Kurdish tribes in the neighbourhood of Van, and the steps taken by the Government to secure order; also a copy of a despatch reporting on disturbances between Kurds and Nestorians, and on the conduct of Tatar Khan, Bey of Berwari.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 87.

Vice-Consul Devey to Consul Chermside.

Van, September 4, 1889.

Sir,

HEREWITH are thrown together some remarks on certain Kurds and Kurdish tribes of these regions, which may be of interest to you.

To begin with, it should be stated that the dispatch of the two battalions, mentioned in my despatch No. 20, was apparently occasioned by a pillaging expedition of the Gevdan Kurds into Mamkoran, from some 40 miles down the valley. Mamkoran is a rich pasture above Beit-es-Shebab, where one of the numerous branches of the considerable Hartushi tribe (from the south) have the right to camp. Major Hilmi Effendi has got well forward in the matter of tax collection among the Nomads; a wholesome terror has been inspired, for the tribes have not forgotten last year's encounters with the troops, and are now anxious to prove their submission and good behaviour. No feud of any importance has taken place in these regions lately; order is preserved, and the detention of Haji Agha, who committed robberies, &c., in Livin and elsewhere last year, by the Mosul authorities, has had a good effect. Haji Agha's camp is about five miles distant from Mervanen, the residence of the Norduz Kaïmakam, and should be located where "Hadschanan Kurden" is printed on Kiepert's large map. His brother, Mehmed Agha, is in charge of his three hundred tents, and this clan of the Hartushi is extremely wealthy and prosperous.

A certain Sheref Agha, of the Shikefti, was imprisoned here two months ago on account of his having plundered Nomads, who had come into the town to buy, on their return of their beasts and grain [*sic*]. The manner of his arrest by a considerable force of zaptiehs, who seized and bound him in full market at the Caza chief place, Khoshab, is said to have created sensation.

Another Sheref Agha, of the Sherefanli tribe, was also arrested and punished. This man excited a tumult in his village, which resulted in the death of a zaptieh sent to collect taxes.

Three other Kurds were quite recently summoned here; they are Mirza Bey, of Diyadin and the Haidevanli, who, to the best of my belief, has been a model tribal Chief for the last dozen years at least; the brigand, Hamzo; and Derbaz Agha.

Hamzo, of the Haideranli, for many years past has been a highway robber in the district between Alashgerd (the Deli Baba Pass) and Eljivaz, on Lake Van. Belying his name, and unlike Kerim, he is reputed a coward, and would never risk his life. It is said that he gave himself up to the Van authorities under a promise of amnesty, and possibly village lands will be assigned to him somewhere in the neighbourhood on his undertaking to settle down quietly.

Derbaz Agha, of the Shemsiki, is from Salahkhané, near the Persian frontier, and bears an execrable reputation.

A rather serious affair has just taken place in Abagha. The intractable Jellali made an attack upon the Haideranli, in which some two or three Kurds were killed; the Alai Bey was at once (*i.e.*, the 31st ultimo) sent with thirty zaptiehs to restore order, and has since been joined by the Mudir of Paus (near Bergri), Jafar Agha, of the Sheveli, with ten more zaptiehs.

The Russian outlaw, Kerim, is said to have come down to Karakenduz, on Archag Lake, six hours from the city, and after staying a couple of days, and sending a message of defiance to the authorities, withdrew to his mountain fastnesses.

From the above it may be gathered that the Government are alive to the importance of securing more order in the departments, and are making serious efforts in this direction.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

Inclosure 2 in No. 87.

Vice-Consul Devey to Consul Chermside.

Van, September 7, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to submit some information respecting the recent conduct of Tatar Khan Bey, of Berwari.

This man has been mentioned in previous despatches relating to Nestorian affairs;

he has been guilty of murder, I am told, and encouraged the disturbances between the Kurds and Nestorians of Tyari last year, and he is hated and abominated by the lower Tyari people, who have made serious complaints against him. His Excellency the Vali has spoken of Tatar Khan Bey to me on several occasions as being a notoriously bad character, and last spring assured me that he was only awaiting a favourable occasion for effecting his exile; this was difficult to accomplish, for other Kurdish Aghas respected and revered him, and, in reference to last year's disturbances, had declared that if Tatar Khan Bey merited punishment, so also did they. On the present occasion it is clear that Tatar Khan Bey evidently intended to provoke a fresh quarrel, involving bloodshed with the Tyari.

The circumstances are as follows: Jeramun is a Nestorian village at the western side of the Tyari Valley, which is placed under the jurisdiction of the Mudir of Berwari, till now Tatar Khan Bey. A new Mudir arrived early in August, but Tatar Khan Bey refused to cede his post, at all events, pending instructions from the Amadieh Kaïmakam. The late Mutessarif had promised that Jeramun should be detached from Amadieh and placed under the Julamerik Caza, because the villagers had complained of Tatar Khan Bey's levying more than his right in collecting the taxes, and then declaring the people of Jeramun had failed to pay; but this was not effected. It appears that this year Jeramun wished to avoid paying its taxes through Tatar Khan Bey, and Melik Ismaïl, one of the leading Tyari Chiefs, and a relation of Mar Shimun, was sent for to receive the sum, and hand it over directly to the Hekkiari Mutessarif. Tatar Khan Bey, who was collecting the taxes of the district, accompanied by a few soldiers, arrived just about the same time; he refused to recognize the Melik's authority for interfering and receiving the taxes, and declared he would not go away without a large sum of money was given to him. The Kaïmakam of Amadieh had at first approved Melik Ismaïl's collecting these taxes, but apparently changed his mind afterwards. Tatar Khan Bey next challenged Melik Ismaïl to fight, but this the Nestorians were disinclined for, especially as there were soldiers with the former. Finally, on the 19th ultimo, some of the villagers being engaged in watering the fields, the Kurds fired on them, and the Jeramun priest was wounded in the neck. Then Melik Ismaïl, who had thirty men with him, came to the rescue, and the engagement lasted throughout the day till the Kurds and soldiers retired. The Melik gave strict orders that the soldiers should not be fired on, but it is said that two of them were killed. Much damage had been done to the Jeramun fields by Tatar Khan Bey in his vexation, but it seems that the Tyari seized 300 sheep and four horses belonging to their foes.

Tatar Khan Bey's object in going to Jeramun was evidently to renew hostilities with the Nestorians. Consequently, it is more desirable than ever that he should be kept at a prudent distance from the Tyari country.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE POLLARD DEVEY.

No. 88.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received October* 18.)

(No. 414.)

My Lord,

Therapia, October 8, 1889.

IN continuation of my despatch No. 387 of the 23rd ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship copy of a further despatch which I have received from Mr. Acting Vice-Consul Boyajian, containing information respecting the menacing language against the Christian ecclesiastics placarded on the doors of some of the churches of Mardin, of which mention was made in Mr. Boyajian's despatch of the 9th September, inclosed in my above-mentioned despatch.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 88.

Acting Vice-Consul Boyajian to Sir W. White.

Kharput, September 23, 1889.

Sir,

IN connection with the third paragraph of my despatch of the 9th instant, I have the honour to respectfully inform your Excellency that in a letter received yesterday from Mardin, I am told that about four months ago one morning placards were found posted on the gates of some of the churches in the town containing foul and menacing language against the ecclesiastics, without stating the mischief intended, that this caused a good deal of alarm among the Christians, and they imagined that they were to be massacred, though nothing of the sort was declared in the said papers, and that steps were taken by the Government to find out the author of this mischief, and a Turk who was suspected has been arrested and put upon his trial, but no evidence could be produced to substantiate the suspicion, and the affair blew over without any serious consequences.

I have, &c.
(Signed) THOMAS BOYAJIAN.

No. 89.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received October 18.)

(No. 415.)

My Lord,

Therapia, October 11, 1889.

IN my despatch No. 353 of the 30th August, I stated that there was every prospect of Moussa Bey undergoing a regular trial, and that witnesses had arrived in Constantinople to give evidence. This trial has, however, not yet taken place, but for some time past a judicial inquiry has been going on, and I instructed Mr. Alvarez, and, on his return, Mr. Stavrides, to ascertain what took place at this inquiry. I have received constant Reports from these gentlemen, with which I have not thought it necessary to trouble your Lordship.

I beg, however, now to inclose a copy of a Memorandum by Mr. Stavrides, showing that the Armenians here differ from the Armenian Committee in London as to the charge respecting Gulizza. The former state that the charge is made against Moussa Bey, while the latter state that it was his brother who was responsible for the abduction.

It is hoped that the interrogatories of this investigation will be published in Turkish and French.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 89.

Memorandum by Mr. Stavrides.

THE information obtained yesterday from the lawyers of the Armenians is to the effect that proceedings are going on very well, and that they have succeeded in proving their accusations against Moussa. The latter, however, tries now to prove an *alibi* by producing false evidence, and the lawyers told me that, if he does so, they are able to bring forward counter-evidence conclusively showing that Moussa's evidence is false. His Excellency the Ambassador asks why Moussa's brother has not been arrested if he is the author of Gyul Izzar's abduction.

What Sharpaz Effendi said was not that Moussa's brother was the author of the crime, but that the Armenian Committee in London stated that the author of the abduction of the girl was Moussa's brother. Why then do the Armenians here try to bring home to Moussa the crime which is attributed to his brother by their associates in London? If Moussa's brother was not arrested it is because, as it seems, no charge was brought against him officially by anybody. At all events, as the lawyers seem satisfied with the proceedings, it seems to me advisable to await the result. I shall, however, put the Ambassador's question to Sharpaz Effendi, and communicate the answer to his Excellency with any other information which I may get from the lawyers.

(Signed) C. G. STAVRIDES.

October 10, 1889.

No. 90.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received October 18.)

(No. 416. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Therapia, October 11, 1889.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 415 of this day's date, I have the honour to state that the United States' Legation has also been using its influence to bring Moussa Bey to trial.

Mr. Pendleton King, the United States' Chargé d'Affaires, has also addressed a note to the Sublime Porte, in which he calls its attention to the fact that Moussa Bey is the same man who, in the year 1883, committed an outrage on two American missionaries, and that, while his guilt was clearly established, he remained unpunished, and asking that, whatever the result of the present trial, he may suffer his punishment for the former outrage.

Mr. King has kindly furnished me confidentially with a copy of this note, which I have now the honour to inclose, for your Lordship's information.

As no complaint whatever has been made by any British subject against Moussa, our title to watch the proceedings in this case rests purely on general grounds, but the rights of the Legation of the United States cannot be questioned. Moreover, they cannot be suspected by any one of being guided by selfish political objects, and I cannot sufficiently express my obligations to Mr. Pendleton King for having acted with me in this matter; and I trust that your Lordship may find some fitting opportunity of conveying to his Government my appreciation of his action, in which he has found means of combining the interests of humanity with the national interests he defends so ably.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 90.

Mr. Pendleton King to Said Pasha.

United States' Legation, Constantinople, October 7, 1889.

M. le Ministre,

PERMIT me to recall to your Excellency's attention an outrage committed on two Americans, Rev. Mr. Knapp and Dr. Reynolds, in the year 1883 near the village of Ghuorie, in the region of Bitlis.

The matter was reported to the Sublime Porte by General Wallace, United States' Minister, in his note of the 13th June, 1883, and in detail in his note of the 10th September, 1883. Many notes were exchanged on the subject during the years 1883-84-85: United States' Legation to Sublime Porte, 7th November, 8th November, 13th December, 1883; 24th January, 1884; and 27th February, 1885; Sublime Porte to United States' Legation, 21st June, 8th December, 1883; 28th January, 27th February, 21st April, 1884; 12th January and 8th April, 1885; and others.

Mr. Knapp was severely beaten with a club, and Dr. Reynolds received two sword cuts; they were dragged into the bushes, gagged, bound, and left to die.

It was well established, as the above notes show, that the leader of the attacking party and the person who inflicted the sword cuts on Dr. Reynolds was Moussa Bey, who has since that time become notorious through many other outrages committed by him.

Through the garbling of the record of the investigation, for which the Examining Magistrate and the Deputy Imperial Prosecutor were afterwards placed under Judgment (see notes from his Excellency Assim Pasha to General Wallace, 21st April, 1884, and 12th January, 1885), Moussa Bey was allowed to go free, and was not again arrested.

My Government regarded "the case of Knapp and Reynolds as clearly made out, and the identification of the principal assailant, Moussa Bey, as complete," and that because he was never punished "justice was denied," and that the last note from the Sublime Porte was neither "final nor satisfactory," and on account of "the magnitude and cruelty of the offence," Mr. Bayard, Secretary of State, instructed this Legation "again to appeal to that sense of justice which should prompt the Turkish Government to make honourable amends for this crime."

Some years have elapsed during which Moussa Bey has gone unpunished for this crime, and his presence in this city to undergo trial for murder and numerous other outrages leads me again to lay this matter before the Sublime Porte, and, while not wishing to interrupt or embarrass the progress of that trial, to request your Excellency (1) to take the necessary measures to prevent the criminal from escaping from this city; and (2) whatever the issue of the above-mentioned trial may be at its close, Moussa Bey may suffer the punishment required by law for this murderous attack on American citizens as above recalled to your Excellency's attention.

Accept, &c.

(Signed) PENDLETON KING,
Chargé d'Affaires, ad interim.

No. 91.

M. Löwy to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received October 24.)

My Lord, 100, *Sutherland Avenue, Maida Vale, October* 24, 1889.

AT the beginning of September, when I was in Constantinople, Her Britannic Majesty's Ambassador was kind enough to put me in direct communication with Kiamil Pasha, the Grand Vizier, in order that I might bring under notice the grievances of the Diarbekir Jews, as set forth in the inclosed translation of a document received by the Anglo-Jewish Association.

The Diarbekir Jews have for many years been exposed to the vexations of the native population, which is noted for its fanaticism. A member of the local Jewish community, who had abstracted, for the sake of gain, an important title-deed, and had stolen other property of the Jews, had, with a view of escaping from the punishment he incurs, embraced the religion of the Moslems, and then helped to aggravate the evils suffered by the Jews of Diarbekir.

The subject of the complaint touches purely the internal affairs of the Turkish Government, and it is for this reason that it was not fitted for being taken up officially by Her Majesty's Representative.

The Grand Vizier very kindly promised that the fullest attention of the Government of the Sultan would be given to the matter. As I know that up to the date of a recent letter from Constantinople no report had been received from Diarbekir, I venture to inquire if, through Her Britannic Majesty's Consulate, it could be ascertained whether the Jews in that town continue to be subjected to the outrages and the persecution as to the deprivation of their property referred to in the inclosure.

I have, &c.

(Signed) A. LOWY.

Inclosure in No. 91.

Abstract from a Letter concerning the Jews of Diarbekir.

WE have to bring under your notice our severe grievances arising from the action of the former treasurer of our congregation, who was one of our religious heads, and before his conversion to Mahommedanism bore the name Haham (ecclesiastic) Isaac. This man has become the persecutor and the terror of the eighty families here, whom, after robbing our community of the value of £ T. 160, he seeks to deprive of their small remaining property. He puts forth all sorts of unfounded accusations, which make us hated by our neighbours.

We have to state the following facts:—

About eight years ago we purchased a water-course (or storage) for the purposes of a "Tchilah" (i.e., a place where religious ablutions are performed). This storage had been the property of a man named Arif, who had sold it to us for £ T. 60, and we held the deed of that purchase. We spent £ T. 100 to carry water to the premises of our synagogue. After the lapse of six years some Mahommedans protested against this purchase, asserting that the water was the property of a mosque, and could not be alienated. The local Court of Justice admitted the validity of this plea. We then applied to Arif, as the original owner of the water-course, either to put us into possession of the property or to refund our outlay. Arif, however, came to an understanding

with Isaac, who abstracted from the synagogue box the deed of purchase, and for this theft received from Arif £ T. 30.

We brought an action against Isaac, and, he being found guilty, the Government authorities estreated his property. This man had purloined many sums of money which we had put by for our payment of the military taxes, and as we had taken legal proceedings against him for his malversations, he contrived to escape the consequences of his acts by abjuring his religion and becoming a Mahommedan. By this conversion he succeeded in regaining his former possessions, and we had to pay an indemnity of £ T. 10 to compensate him for his legal expenses. We protested repeatedly, and always in vain.

We have here to add that four persons of our community, visiting some neighbouring villages, have been put to death with impunity. Revolting outrages, which recur here from year to year, may also be mentioned in connection with our actual troubles. Several corpses are annually dragged from their resting places. The heads are thrown into the river, and the other portions of the bodies are surrendered to the dogs.

We loyally acknowledge that His Majesty the Sultan graciously desires that our claims to justice should be respected, but the subaltern authorities continue to oppress us, and thus our rights are trodden under foot.

Our ex-Haham seeks to crush us. His misdeeds are encouraged by persons in power; therefore we humbly entreat you to intercede for us, with the view that we may be placed under the safe and full protection of justice, and in future we may be left entirely unmolested by our present persecutors.

Blomfield House, 85, London Wall, London,
October 23, 1889.

No. 92.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received November 29.)

(No. 161.)

My Lord, *Constantinople, November* 21, 1889.

SINCE writing my despatch No. 415 of the 11th October the preliminary inquiry into charges against Moussa Bey has been continued in a desultory manner, but I have repeatedly instructed Mr. Stavrides to see the judicial authorities, and inquire how the case was proceeding.

On the 5th instant Mr. Stavrides reported to me that he had been invited to attend an appeal made by the plaintiffs from an "Ordonnance de non-lieu" given by the "Juge d'Instruction" on one of the charges brought against Moussa Bey. I did not, however, think it desirable that Mr. Stavrides should attend, as Her Majesty's Embassy had been kept in ignorance of the "instruction" from the commencement up to date.

I have also urged the Turkish Government to take action against other persons besides Moussa Bey, who may not hitherto have been brought to trial for offences committed in those provinces against Armenians, and I am assured that such charges will be inquired into on the spot.

It has been very difficult to obtain reliable information from the plaintiffs themselves or their legal advisers, but I have been assured that the interrogatories will be published. I have also urged that if, as I hear there is good evidence, Moussa is guilty on any grave charges, he should be imprisoned.

I have the honour to inclose a copy of a Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez, reporting his conversation with various judicial officials, and stating that Moussa is in confinement in the official residence of his friend, Bahri Pasha, the Governor of Scutari, Constantinople, and that the trial is to begin on Saturday next. This trial will be public, but I am as yet unable to say what are the indictments.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 92.

Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez.

IN recapitulation of information already communicated verbally to his Excellency the Ambassador, I have to state that on Sunday I went to the Ministry of Justice in order to find out whether Moussa Bey was actually imprisoned pending his trial, as reported in the local press, or not. As I could see nobody at the Ministry of Justice except the Assistant Public Prosecutor of Stamboul, who was not in a position to give me any reliable information, I proceeded to the Grand Vizirate, where the Council of Ministers was sitting, and saw Jevdet Pasha, Minister of Justice. His Excellency could not positively state that Moussa Bey was under arrest, although he believed that such was the fact, but he informed me that the order for his arrest had been given on Thursday, in consequence of the decision of the Chamber of Accusation that on one of the three points submitted for its consideration there was a case against him, and that he believed he had been brought before the Criminal Court of Appeal as a prisoner, and informed that his trial would begin on Saturday next. Asked on what case sufficient evidence had been found against Moussa Bey, his Excellency could not tell me. The next day I called on Ali Schahbar Effendi, who confirmed Jevdet Pasha's statements, but could not state of his own knowledge whether Moussa Bey was in prison or not, though he presumed such was the case. He added that in all probability Moussa Bay was arrested on the arrival of the order to that effect at Scutari at about 11 o'clock, "à la Turque," in the evening; and Ibrahim Bey, who conducted the unofficial inquiry before the judicial one, testified to the fact that the accused was brought before the Criminal Court as a prisoner, and, after Izzet Bey had been appointed as his lawyer, was sent back to Scutari.

Schahbar Effendi stated to me that the proceedings in the Instruction Department would be published in the "Journal of Tribunals" (Jeridé v. Uckayu) if possible before Saturday, the day of the trial, in order that all doubt as to the regularity of the proceedings should be dispelled.

I had some conversation with Ibrahim Bey and Schahbaz Effendi as to various irregularities alleged to have been committed, such as, for example, the cigarettes and coffee incident, &c. Both strenuously denied the existence of these irregularities, especially during the course of the judicial interrogatory, although Ibrahim Bey admitted having given cigarettes and coffee to Moussa Bey, and asserted that he had done the same to the plaintiffs during the inquiry conducted by himself. Ibrahim Bey complained of his interview with Moussa Bey at the village of Izod given by Consul Longworth as being opposed to the facts. He states that Moussa Bey appeared before him as a suppliant, and, after a conversation in which he complained of the charges made against him, requested Ibrahim Bey's protection, and presented a Petition stating his case.

In order to satisfy himself that Moussa Bey was really under arrest I went to Scutari and made inquiries of the Public Prosecutor of Scutari and the Chief Commissioner of Police. Both confirmed the statements of the Minister and Schahbaz Effendi as regards the arrest, and the Police Commissioner added that he was strictly looked after, and that there was no possibility of his escape, and that he was sent to the Court and brought back to Scutari with a guard.

It is worthy of remark that although the practice after the Chamber of Accusation has found a case against the prisoner is for him to be transferred to the Central Prison at Stamboul, there to be kept at the disposal of the Criminal Court, this practice has been departed from in this instance, and Moussa Bey is now detained in the official residence of Bahri Pasha, Mutessarif of Scutari, and his uncle by marriage.

According to his Excellency's instructions, Mr. King, American Chargé d'Affaires, has been informed of the result of my inquiries, and Mr. Cargiulo, the Dragoman of the Legation, will be instructed to be present at Moussa Bey's trial on Saturday should the British Embassy and the American Legation be invited to send their Dragomans to the Criminal Court on that day.

(Signed) J. ALVAREZ.

November 19, 1889.

No. 93.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received November 29.)

(No. 462. Confidential.)

My Lord, *Constantinople, November 21, 1889.*

WITH reference to my immediately preceding despatch No. 461 of this day's date, I have the honour to transmit herewith a translation of a Memorandum which I have caused to be presented, on the 16th instant, to the Grand Vizier, in an unofficial manner, by Sir Alfred Sandison.

The Memorandum calls attention to certain irregularities which have come to my knowledge with regard to the preliminary stages of the Moussa Bey trial.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 93.

Memorandum presented to the Grand Vizier.

(Translation.)

THE following facts and considerations, as they have reference to the trial of Moussa Bey, and are of primary importance, are set forth here as follows:—

According to the dispositions of the Law, any person accused of a crime, on the production of proofs and witnesses, is to be placed under arrest. Now, Moussa Bey, although accused by the testimony of many of having committed five murders, caused several fires, robbed and stripped several people on several occasions, has not yet been put under arrest. It is true that, under a special Article of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the arrest of a person accused of crime is made dependent on the decision of the "Juge d'Instruction." But in the present case it would seem as if the "Juge d'Instruction" could not have abstained from giving the order of arrest, after the amount of evidence he has received. Besides, under the terms of a Circular of the Ministry of Justice, issued after the publication of the Law, a person accused of crime must in any case be placed under arrest. Notwithstanding all these considerations, the accused, Moussa Bey, has not been put under arrest. Moreover, the "Procureur-Général," at the time when he had brought an accusation against Moussa Bey, had also brought accusations against those who took part in the crimes of which the Bey is accused, such as his brother, brother-in-law, and a score more. The witnesses produced comprised these persons in their evidence in the same way that the plaintiffs brought accusations against the above-mentioned individuals. It was consequently necessary to put those people also under arrest. At the same time, since the action brought against these persons is connected with that lodged against Moussa, the Iradé ordering the examination of the Bey at Constantinople must of necessity apply to them also, and they ought in consequence to be brought before the Criminal Court of Constantinople to be judged together with Moussa. This is required both by the Law and by justice.

Another fact deserves equal consideration. When the plaintiffs left for Constantinople, it is a matter of public notoriety that Moussa's brother, Jezo by name, and his brother-in-law, Emner Bey, indulged in crimes of murder and robbery. These crimes apparently had, as an object, to frighten the witnesses who were to be sent to Constantinople and those who were to be brought forward later; whilst those who were here, fearing for the safety of their families and their possessions left behind in their country, were thrown into a state of terror and despair.

This also must not be lost sight of, that the plaintiffs as well as the witnesses, being poor and deprived of all means of sustenance, will be unable in the long-run to resist this state of destitution and of difficulty to live, and they will not have courage to fulfil their task to the end. In this manner, it is to be feared that the ends of justice will be frustrated. And yet the gracious Iradé of His Imperial Majesty the Sultan rendered it necessary to provide for the subsistence of these persons. To leave them in this state of distress is contrary to the Sultan's will.

From information received, Ali Agha's witnesses are accused in the Courts of being false witnesses. Now, an action for giving false evidence could only be brought during the investigation into the principal charge, or else after the rendering of the Court's Judgment on it. Consequently, the only object of such an action for false testimony could be as follows:—

Ali Agha's complaint, after the investigation which has taken place, had reached the stage when it would have to be referred to the "Chambre des Mises en Accusation," which could only order the arrest of Moussa. It was, therefore, to save Moussa from this that the action for false evidence was brought, and the further object in view was apparently to frighten the witnesses, the production of which had been decided on with reference to the abduction and rape of the girl Gulèzar and the murder of her father.

These facts, such as they are, deserve the Sublime Porte's most serious consideration.

No. 94.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received November 29.)

(No. 463. Secret.)

Constantinople, November 22, 1889.

My Lord,

WITH reference to my despatch No. 461 of yesterday's date, I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez, reporting certain confidential information he has been able to obtain with regard to the action and language of Bakri Pasha, the Governor of Scutari, Constantinople.

Mr. Alvarez also states that attempts have been made to intimidate two Armenian priests, important witnesses against Moussa Bey.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 94.

Memorandum.

(Secret and Confidential.)

FROM information received to-day, it appears there was no conflict of facts between the statement made to me by Javdet Pasha at the Porte and those made to his Excellency the Ambassador from other sources. The two points on which the Chamber of Accusation did not pronounce are the cases of burglary and extortion referred to in my Memorandum of to-day's date, and the third point is the case of arson, which will be taken on Saturday. As regards the second case, Kumasch Khatun's charge of wilful murder of her husband, Malkhass, the Public Prosecutor, Khaled Bey, said he only knew it was going for trial on Saturday (this morning), and Javdet Pasha declared to Schahbaz Effendi it was the first time he had heard that this case was going to be tried. There are two priests who give evidence in this case, Gaspar and Manbré Effendis, but fears were expressed by the Public Prosecutor and plaintiff's lawyer that they had been got at, and attempts made to intimidate them. If only one attends for examination by the Court, proof of the case and consequent conviction of Moussa will probably be impossible, and these two witnesses are therefore sharply watched. Simon Effendi Tinghir, Megherditch Agha's lawyer, told me confidentially, and Khaled Bey practically confirmed his statement, that owing to the expense only two witnesses for each of the three accusations in Megherditch's action could be brought from Ardonk to Constantinople. Thus probably not more than two or three witnesses at most will give evidence in this case.

Schahbaz Effendi, when assuring me that Moussa was in safe custody, told me, in confidence, that Bakry Pasha somehow or other learnt that Moussa Bey was about to be arrested under a warrant of the Chamber of Accusation before that body issued the warrant, and at once complained at the Palace. He received a strict injunction to conform absolutely to any orders he might receive from the Ministry of Justice or its Departments, and was severely reprimanded. From another reliable source I hear that Bakry Pasha maintains that, had it not been through his intervention and persuasion of Moussa to come to the capital and plead his cause, Moussa Bey would have broken out into open rebellion against the Sultan.

(Signed) J. ALVAREZ.

November 21, 1889.

P.S.—I forgot to mention that various officials of the Ministry of Justice, after my visit to that Department on Sunday, received instructions from Schahbaz Effendi not to give me any information with regard to Moussa without his knowledge or Javdet Pasha's.

J. A.

No. 95.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received November 29.)

(No. 464.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, November 22, 1889.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 461 of yesterday's date, I have the honour to inclose herewith a copy of a Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez, reporting conversations which he had yesterday with Schahbaz Effendi and the Public Prosecutor, Khalid Bey, on the subject of the case of Moussa Bey.

From this Memorandum, it would appear that there are two serious cases against Moussa Bey, one of murder and one of arson, on which he is now to take his trial. This Memorandum is also accompanied by a complete list of the different actions instituted against Moussa Bey. A translation is herewith inclosed. From this it would appear that there were ten indictments against Moussa Bey. In the first five, an "Ordonnance de Non-lieu" was given by the "Juge d'Instruction," on the ground of insufficient evidence; against this "Ordonnance," on charges 1, 2, and 3, appeal was made by the prosecution to the "Chambre des Mises en Accusation," and that Court confirmed the "Ordonnance" on charge 1, but on charge 3, on the count of burning the crops, and on charge 4, of wilful murder, reversed the "Ordonnance" and sent the cases for trial. In the last five, evidence of parties and witnesses here has been taken, but further evidence is required on the spot, either for the prosecution or for the defence, which has been telegraphed for and is awaited.

The trial is to begin to-morrow, and I shall not fail to keep your Lordship informed of the results of the proceedings.

Your Lordship is well aware how delicate a subject the question of the trial of Moussa Bey is considered here; my efforts to obtain a fair and impartial scrutiny of the numerous charges against him have been constant and unceasing, but naturally these have been conducted in a private and confidential form, and the arguments which I have employed to attain this end are not such as with proper discretion can be made public, though I have no doubt that they will meet with your Lordship's approbation, and if they could be made known without detriment to the public service, they would also correspond to the feelings entertained at home on the subject.

I have been much surprised to observe in home papers a paragraph as if emanating from the Committee of the Armenian Patriotic Association (see "Daily News" of Tuesday, November 14, p. 5), according to which "the Ambassadors of the Six Great Powers at Constantinople are reported to have made representations to the Porte in connection with Moussa Bey's case." I am convinced that this assertion is completely inaccurate.

Yesterday, the Russian Ambassador having called upon me, I mentioned this statement to his Excellency, upon which he said, "There is one Ambassador I know who did nothing of the kind, and that is myself."

Of the other four, I am perfectly certain that this assertion is equally untrue.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 95.

Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez.

WITH reference to the different charges brought against the Kurdish Chieftain, Moussa Bey, I have to state, for the information of his Excellency the Ambassador,

that I went to the Ministry of Justice with the intention of seeing Jevdet Pasha, and making various inquiries. Jevdet Pasha was very busy with the affairs of his Department, and was subsequently sent for from the Porte. Shahbaz Effendi was instructed, however, to speak in the Minister's name, and I therefore proceeded to ask him what were the charges on which Moussa Bey would be tried on Saturday. He replied that they were two. One case, Megherditch Agha and his father *versus* Moussa Bey, accused of burning the plaintiffs' crops of corn and hay, and the other Kumasch Khatun against the same accused, who is charged with having three years ago wounded and killed Malkhar, or Mamuk, the plaintiff's husband. In both cases, the plaintiffs belonged to the village of Ardouk, near Musch.

Through the kindness of Khaled Bey, the Public Prosecutor to the Appeal Courts, who will personally conduct the prosecution of Moussa Bey on Saturday on behalf of the Government, I obtained a complete list of the different actions instituted against Moussa. Although unofficial, it has evidently been drawn up under the direction of Hussein Sedky Effendi, the Judge of Instruction, charged with the interrogatories in these actions. From it will be seen that these cases are ten in number. The annexed translation by Mr. Black shows that they contain two charges of violation, three of murder, one of burning alive, one of causing death, one of wounding, one of burglary, three of cattle lifting, four of robbery of other property, one of violent extortion of money, and two of arson.

In the first case to be taken on Saturday, two charges of burglary and extortion, besides the one of arson, which will be pressed, have already been set aside by "Ordonnance de Non-lieu," which has not been appealed against. In the second case to be heard, an appeal has been lodged against an "Ordonnance de Non-lieu," and Moussa Bey has consequently been indicted for wilful murder. The last five cases are, from various causes, still pending. In the remaining cases "Ordonnances de Non-lieu" have been pronounced, and in one case confirmed by the Chamber of Accusation. The cases of the girl "Gulizar," and of Ali, the muleteer, of Diarbekir, are amongst those pending.

As regards the publication of the interrogatories, Shahbaz Effendi declared, in the Minister's name, that the interrogatories, not only in those cases which are sent before the Criminal Court, but also in those quashed by the Chamber of Accusation, or in which the Public Prosecutor has considered himself bound to issue an "Ordonnance de Non-lieu," not appealed against, that is to say, the whole of the secret judicial interrogatories shall be published. He also solemnly assured me that both the Minister and himself desired the scrutiny of the utmost publicity possible, in proof of which desire, in addition to the regular interrogatories, Ibrahim Bey's official Report, summarizing the investigation carried on by him, of no legal validity, should also be published. The "Jeridè y Mehakym" (Journal of Tribunals) will appear on Saturday, and will contain a preface to the interrogatories, Ibrahim Bey's Report, and part of the judicial interrogatory. Schahbaz Effendi told me he would seriously consider the possibility of issuing a supplementary number of the paper on Monday, containing the remainder of the interrogatories, and while I was in his office he gave the most stringent orders for precedence to be given to the preparation of these documents for the press over all other articles. When I complained of Moussa's not having been treated in the same way that any other person accused of criminal offences would have been, *i.e.*, of his having been allowed to remain in detention at Scutari in the official residence of Bakry Pasha, his relative, who is Governor there, instead of being incarcerated at the central prison at Stamboul, as is usually the case when the Chamber of Accusation has declared a case against the prisoner, and he is held at the disposal of the Criminal Court of Appeal under the warrant issued for his arrest, Schahbaz Effendi admitted the justice of my remark at once, and declared he could not approve of such procedure.

(Signed) J. ALVAREZ.

November 21, 1889.

No. 95 A.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received December 2, 9·35 P.M.*)

(No. 74.)
(Telegraphic.) *Constantinople, December 2, 1889, 6·20 P.M.*

AFTER a protracted public trial, Moussa has been acquitted this afternoon on all the three counts on which he was charged. Details of trial by messenger.

No. 95 B.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir W. White.

(No. 396.)
Foreign Office, December 6, 1889.

Sir,

I HAVE received your Excellency's despatch No. 462, Confidential, of the 21st ultimo, respecting the trial of Moussa Bey, and I approve of your having communicated to the Grand Vizier a Memorandum calling attention to certain irregularities which had come to your knowledge with regard to the preliminary stages of the inquiry.

I am, &c.
(Signed) SALISBURY.

Inclosure 2 in No. 95.

The Charges against the Kurd, Moussa Bey.

CHARGE against Moussa Bey of having ten years ago violated Eyouz, the daughter of Tranos, of the village of Izzod.

Note.—For want of proof, on the 16th September an "Ordonnance" of "Non-lieu" was given.

The "Ordonnance de Non-lieu" was confirmed by the Chambre des "Mises en Accusation."

2. Charge of Hourshid, son of Asadur, of the village of Tetran, that Moussa Bey fifteen months ago stole the bullocks of Hourshid's brother, Serapin, and caused his death.

Note.—The want of proofs on "Ordonnance" of "Non-lieu" was given on the 16th September.

3. Charge by Maghirditch, of the village of Ardouk, that Moussa Bey has burnt his granary and crops and has demolished the wall of his house by night, and had stolen his property, and had bound his brother, Garabet, and extorted from the same 20 liras.

Note.—As sufficient legal evidence was not forthcoming, on the 9th November an "Ordonnance de Non-lieu" was given.

Opposition was made to this decision, and the charge of burning the granary is to be proceeded with.

4. Charge of Koumash, a woman of the village of Ardouk, that Moussa Bey three years ago had robbed and murdered her husband, Manouk.

Note.—There being no legal evidence forthcoming that Moussa Bey had wounded Manouk, on the 8th October an "Ordonnance de Non-lieu" was given.

Opposition having been made to the "Ordonnance de Non-lieu" the accusation of murder with premeditation was sustained, and the trial will be proceeded with on this count.

5. Charge by Tranos, son of Ohannés, of the village of Tapa Mervan, that Moussa Bey had stolen two sheep and two cows.

Note.—There being no kind of evidence to sustain this charge, on the 12th October an "Ordonnance de Non-lieu" was given.

6. Charge by Miro, of the village of Kharir, that Moussa Bey had killed his father, Agop, and had stolen his goods and chattels, and had violated his niece, Gulizar, and carried her off.

Note.—The evidence of the parties and witnesses here has been taken, and as Miro requested that the evidence of some thirty witnesses in the Province of Moush should be taken, telegraphic orders were sent to the spot, and the written evidence from them is expected.

7. Charge by Ali, muleteer of Diarbekir, and by merchants of Van, that Moussa Bey had stolen their goods and chattels.

Note.—The evidence of the parties and of the witnesses here has been taken, and telegraphic orders have been sent (to the province) that the evidence of certain witnesses for the defence whom Moussa Bey has designated should be taken, and the papers from there are awaited.

8. Charge by Mourad, of the village of Tetran, that Moussa Bey had killed his father, Manouk, and his uncle, Agob, and had stolen their goods.

Note.—The evidence of the parties and of the witnesses here has been taken, and telegraphic orders have been sent that an inquiry should be made on certain points on the spot, and the answer is expected.

9. Charge by Serrol, of the village of Vartemis, that Moussa Bey had wounded him and stolen his cattle.

Note.—Documents containing inquiry on the spot are being awaited.

10. Charge by Guleza, of the village of Ardorank, against Moussa, of burning her husband, Ohan, alive, of plundering his property, and burning his hay.

Note.—Witnesses here and parties have given their evidence, and telegraphic orders have been given for necessary investigations on the spot, and the reply is awaited.

No. 96.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received December 13.*)

(No. 474.) *Constantinople, November 27, 1889.*

My Lord,

WITH reference to my despatch No. 464 of the 22nd instant, I have the honour to report that the trial of Moussa Bey began on the 23rd instant.

I instructed Mr. Alvarez to attend unofficially, and to report to me what took place.

I have the honour to inclose a copy of a Memorandum by that gentleman, giving a detailed and circumstantial account of the proceedings of the first sitting of the Court.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 96.

Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez.

IN accordance with the instructions of his Excellency the Ambassador, I attended the day before yesterday at the Criminal Court of Appeal for Constantinople for the hearing of the first among the numerous actions brought against the well-known Kurdish Chief, Moussa Bey. M. Gargiulo, 1st Dragoman of the American Legation here, accompanied me. We arrived at the Court a little before 12 o'clock, and on entering the corridor found it crammed with an enormous crowd, through which, with some difficulty, we made our way to the Judges' room. On coming in we found three of the Judges present, as well as Hussein Tewfik Pasha Widinly, General of Division, and formerly Minister of Finance and Ottoman Minister at Washington, recently proposed by the Porte for the post of Ambassador at Rome, and also a naval officer, one of the Sultan's aides-de-camp, Captain Ahmed Bey. These officers, who spoke English, had evidently been sent by the Palace to watch the proceedings. With them, for the same purpose, was Ahmed Djelal Eddin Pasha, Chef du Bureau Politique to His Majesty the Sultan. His Excellency Vassif Effendi, President of the Court, soon arrived, and by this time the expectant crowd was so numerous, and had so much difficulty in finding place at the Court, that at one moment it appeared that there would have been an invasion of the Judges' room. When the President was informed that Moussa Bey had arrived, and had been placed in the dock, and that Khaled Bey, Public Prosecutor of the Court of Appeal, Simon Tinghir Effendi, attorney for the plaintiffs, and Izzet Bey and Mehmet Ali Effendi, attorneys for the defence, as well as the witnesses, were present, he and the other Judges entered and took their seats. The two Pashas and Ahmed Bey, M. Gargiulo and myself, and Mr. Hardinge, who arrived shortly after the commencement of the proceedings, were accommodated with seats on the Bench behind the Judges, and in small reserved spaces on either side of us I noticed Messrs. Ledoulx, Gaspardi, and Podesth, French, Austrian, and Italian Dragomans, and several members of the Ottoman Bar.

The Court-room was literally packed, and the greatest interest was taken by those present in the proceedings, which were frequently disturbed, especially in the beginning, by the angry knocking for admittance on the doors of the Court by the disappointed crowd outside. In the audience I noticed Europeans, Turks, Greeks, Armenians, and Kurds.

The Court was composed of the President, Vassif Effendi; Emin, Tahsin, and Nicoluki Haralambidis Effendis, Judges; and Artin Effendi Mosditchian, Assistant Judge, the two last being Christians, respectively Greek and Armenian. The proceedings commenced at about 12·15 by the President calling upon Moussa Bey, who had two policemen behind him, as usual in criminal cases, to stand up and give his name. Moussa Bey did so, and I could see that he was above the middle height, and was of slightly fair complexion and gentlemanly appearance, wearing a fez, black stamboriine, and trousers. Khaled Bey then demanded that the plaintiffs and defendant should be specified, asking at the same time in what capacity was Simon Effendi Tinghir present. Simon Effendi stated that he represented Migherditch and the woman Koomash. Khaled Bey thereupon objected to the recognition of

Migherditch as plaintiff, on the ground that in the interrogatory and in a Petition to the Chamber of Accusation he had described himself as an informant, thereby debarring himself from being a plaintiff. Migherditch's father, Ohannes, might be a plaintiff, but there was no power of attorney from him to Simon Effendi, and he therefore asked for the exclusion of Migherditch and Simon Effendi from pleading in the case. Simon Effendi replied, amid much noise caused by the crowd not admitted to the Court, that Migherditch had been insulted, and was, therefore, entitled to prosecute Moussa Bey on that ground. Migherditch's father, Ohannes, then (at Bitlis), also a plaintiff, had been telegraphed to on Thursday evening for instructions. But even if Migherditch had taken no step to constitute himself a plaintiff while he had been summoned as such, was he not admissible in that capacity? He left the point to the appreciation of the Court. Defendant's lawyers, Izzet Bey and Mehemet Ali Effendi, maintained that Migherditch had no legal position. This Simon Effendi denied, adding that his power of attorney was in perfect order.

The Public Prosecutor again insisted on Migherditch being excluded from the position of plaintiff, adding that the Chamber of Accusation had rejected his Petition; also that Migherditch had made no statement of his having sustained personal damage. Ohannes, too, should have been present at the Court, notwithstanding his issue of a power of attorney, supposing it to exist, but as Ohannes was not present, and as no power of attorney had actually been given, he must insist on exclusion of Ohannes as plaintiff. Simon Effendi rejoined that, even supposing a mistake had been committed in drawing up the Petition to the Chamber of Accusation, that would not alter the facts of the case. If Migherditch had suffered personally, he must be a plaintiff. The fact was at the interrogatory he had declared himself a plaintiff, and now appeared as such. The Public Prosecutor denied the existence of such a Petition. Izzet Bey, for the defence, expressed his intention of availing himself to the full of the wide latitude allowed by law, and maintained that Migherditch's depositions were all made on behalf of the plaintiff, his father, and that a Petition must be presented before he could be a plaintiff. Mehemet Ali Effendi remarked that Simon Effendi spoke as a lawyer on behalf of the plaintiff who had not yet been specified, which was irregular. On this point he had the support of the Public Prosecutor. After rejoinder from Simon Effendi, and further repetition of his previous arguments by Public Prosecutor, the Court reserved its decision on this point, but decided to admit Simon Effendi as provisional representative of Ohannes, on the understanding that a confirmatory telegram should be received from him. Referring to the woman Koomash's action, Khaled Bey argued that it could not be heard to-day, as five days have not elapsed from the communication of the "Mazbata" (Report) of the Chamber of Accusation as required by law, it having been presented on Thursday to the Criminal Court of Appeal.

During this delay the withdrawal of the Report may be demanded. Izzet Bey stated that the defence would profit by this right. Simon Effendi demanded that the two cases should be heard at the same time, Moussa being in both defendant. The Public Prosecutor asking for a decision on this point, Koomash was informed that her case could not be taken that day, and was assisted to leave the Court by the ushers.

In answer to various questions put by the President, Moussa stated his name and age (30 or 31), origin (from Moush), and the fact that he had farms and other property there. He was told to listen to the reading of the documents containing the charges brought against him for what he did at the villages of Ardank, near Moush. The Mazbata of the Chamber of Accusation was then read. I annex a translation of this document communicated to the "Tarik," and printed yesterday.

The Act of Accusation was then read, to the effect that Moussa Bey was charged on the three counts above mentioned under Article 163.

The President then addressed Moussa.—You are accused of having burnt hay and barley inside and outside of Ohannes' granary, in the village of Ardank; of having made a hole in the wall of the house and entered it; of having tied Ohannes and his son, and maltreated them three years ago. Did you commit these crimes?

Public Prosecutor.—Allow me to explain the details of the case first, and then Moussa Bey can be questioned.

President (to Public Prosecutor).—Continue.

Public Prosecutor.—The charges which motive the accusations of Moussa Bey, according to the Mazbata of the Chamber of Accusation, are three: (1) arson; (2) burglary and theft; (3) robbery with violence. These I shall explain in the order of events according to course of inquiry. The arson, according to the statement of two witnesses, took place three years ago at night, and, according to official local

information, on the night of the 16th July, 1303; that is to say, two years ago, in the granary and haystacks of Ohannes of Ardank, in Sandjak of Moush, but notwithstanding Ohannes has petitioned the authorities of Moush, and asserted that the fire was set at the instigation of Moussa Bey or his relative, Suleiman Bey, now deceased, he has stated he was unable to prove it, and that case has remained in the same position. Inquiries have now been made on the issue of His Imperial Majesty's first Decree for Moussa Bey's being summoned to Constantinople and the plaintiffs' cases being tried. Ohannes' son, Migherditch, at Constantinople, is examined. Though he admits he has been here for three years, and has not in that time gone back to his country, he afterwards asserts he was present at the arson, which he saw, and afterwards states in another deposition that he was then at Bitlis, and did not see the fire. This, notwithstanding, he says, he will prove by two witnesses, Boghos and Agop, that Moussa Bey and his accomplices committed this arson. Boghos, son of Bedian, and Agop, son of Parma, are summoned and examined.

According to their deposition, on the night of Thursday, the 24th July, three years ago, Moussa Bey and his accomplices came to the village of Ardank on horseback, and they saw them, with lights in their hands, set fire to Ohannes' granary and haystacks. On their shouting out the villagers came to the place, and Moussa Bey and his associates ran away.

As regards the burglary and robbery, when this action for theft was brought formally in the locality against Derwish Hatch Oghlou, of the village of Marinick, the act was not proven, and the "Ordonnance de Non-Lieu" in favour of Derwish was issued on the 30th April, 1305, whereas now Migherditch states that the theft was committed by Moussa Bey and his associates two months after the fire, and that he will prove his claim by Boghos, son of Vartan Minass and Hajji Kevork, and two and a-half months after this robbery Moussa Bey and his accomplices came to their house, bound his father, Ohannes, and his elder brother, Carabet, to a pillar, and, by threatening them, took 20 liras by force. Proved by Otan, *alias* Ohannes, son of Moultar, and Boghos, son of Vartan Bedian, when examined.

Hajji Kevork and Minass, pointed out as witnesses for the burglary and robbery, say they know nothing about it; but according to the statements of Boghos, son of Vartan Bedian, and Ohannes, witness in the third case of robbery, while they were sitting in a room at about 3:30 or 4:30 one night in October, two years and a-half ago, they heard dogs barking, went out, looked and saw Moussa Bey and his accomplices breaking through Migherditch's roof or stone wall, 1 arshin thick, with clubs, taking out through the hole the bed, clothes, and other property, and going away with them.

Coming to the question of robbery with violence, according to the deposition of Hajji Kevork, who is one of the witnesses indicated for another charge, it took place twenty-two months ago, in winter, and, according to Minass' deposition, a year and a-half ago. On Saturday before Christmas Day, a fast day, Moussa and his accomplices came about 11 o'clock in the evening and tied up Migherditch's father, Ohannes, and his elder brother, Carabet, and demanded 20 liras. Until they got the money, they kept them tied up for three hours, or, according to another account, for four or five hours, and on getting the money they left. The "Ordonnance de Non-Lieu," which was given by the Judge of Instruction on account of the course of inquiry and the discrepancies between Migherditch's evidence and that of the witnesses, was annulled by the Chamber of Accusation, and Moussa Bey has been brought before your honourable Court charged with criminal offences. As His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, a most just Sovereign and protector of his subjects, devotes himself to the administration of justice to all, and as it is our duty to direct our energies exclusively to this admirable object, I demand that the witnesses whose names are on the list handed in should be heard, and the trial of the accused proceeded with most attentively.

President (addressing Moussa Bey).—Have you anything to say? The documents have been read, and you have heard what the Public Prosecutor has said.

Moussa Bey.—Yes, I have; but I don't know Turkish well. Let me have an interpreter.

President.—Talk as well as you can.

Moussa Bey.—Salih Pasha was Mutessarif of Moush. Salih Pasha sent for me one day. We sat down and ate together. Suleiman Bey was also there. Ohannes came. "My stable has been burnt," said he. I had heard of it, as I arrived on that day. I was then Mudir (Sub-Governor) in those parts when Arif Pasha was Vali. Does any Mudir act in this way to those under his administration? I was busy collecting revenue thirty hours' distance from the place at the time they mention.

The cause of their complaint is the fact that I put some pressure on them as required by my duties in order to get the "verghy" (land-tax) due by their priest to Government, a large amount which he would not pay, and to the fact that I arrested and sent him to Salih Pasha. After that everybody, down to the servants and watchmen, complained of me. "We don't want Moussa Bey," said they. I went to Bitlis. "Let them come and prosecute me," said I. They did not come. If any improper action has been taken by me or my men, I am ready to suffer any penalty. I and my family have always been loyal to Government, from father to son.

President.—No action is brought without a cause. Is there any hostility or feud between you?—*A.* Yes, four or five villages are hostile to me: Ardank, Vartenis, &c., owing to disputes with my tribe.

President.—There is the charge that you tied the father and brother of Migherditch, who is here, to a post, and took 20 liras from him?

Moussa Bey.—No; I lent Ohannes 100 liras. We had a garden, which we cultivated in common. He had recourse to the intervention of the Vali Pasha, and sent word to me saying, "I have made no money this year," in order that I should not ask for the money. Migherditch's brother, Agop, brought me from the garden a lot of water melons and vegetable marrows, which I made him a present of, and 40 medjidies, which I took. Such was his statement at the "Adlie." Now, he says, 20 liras (murmurs among the audience). Izzet Bey explains the term "Adlie" to mean the Court of Bitlis.

Public Prosecutor.—It is now the turn of the witnesses to be examined, but they ought not to be together. As a matter of fact, their depositions in the Instruction Department are contradictory, and perhaps their statements here will also be contradictory. We should be hindered from getting the truth if they hear each other's statement. Boghos and Agop will be heard first. They will give evidence on the point of arson. Let Boghos be brought here, and Agop kept in another room.

Izzet Effendi.—My client has been prosecuted on the three charges of arson, burglary, and robbery with violence; has been brought to your honourable Court, and has been placed in the dock on Migherditch's denunciation. In Migherditch's deposition at the interrogatory there are all sorts of contradictions. Migherditch shall be examined now, if your Lordship approves of the suggestion.

Public Prosecutor.—The time for his examination has not yet come; he will be examined after witnesses have been heard.

Izzet Effendi.—While witnesses are being heard Migherditch must not be present, as he may develop his plans from the statements of witnesses.

Then recess of the Court for a quarter of an hour.

On its return—

President.—We will now hear the witnesses.

Public Prosecutor.—My Lord, first let a decision be given on the point of Migherditch's presence or absence.

The Public Prosecutor insisting on this point, by the President's order Migherditch was removed.

Public Prosecutor.—Let the two witnesses be kept separate, and not hear or communicate with each other.

President.—We will hear them in turn. The witnesses are now in the Clerk's office under surveillance, and cannot hear.

Witness Boghos, son of Migherditch, was called and said:—

I don't know how old I am, 40 or 45; my village is Ardank, in the plain of Moush. I am a labourer.

Witness sworn.

The Public Prosecutor, not being satisfied with the witness' manner of taking the oath, as he did not keep his hand on the Gospel, by permission of the President pronounced the formula himself, and told witness to repeat his words exactly:—

Do you swear to tell the whole truth, and nothing or less than the truth, so help you God?

The witness, an ignorant rustic, repeated what the Prosecutor had said, word for word (laughter among the audience).

Eventually the oath was properly taken.

President.—Tell the truth about what you saw and know.—*A.* I have sworn to tell the truth: I saw Moussa Bey fire the hay and store-house.

Q. Where were you then?—*A.* On my rick?

Q. What o'clock was it?—*A.* 4 or 5 o'clock.

Q. Were you alone?—*A.* Yes.

Q. Was it in the day-time or at night?—A. At midnight.

Q. Did Moussa Bey come alone?—A. No; with him were Eumer Bey, Djezai Bey, Chalow Mourad Bey, and several servants.

Q. Did you know the servants?—A. No.

Q. How did you see the fire?—A. I was on my rick.

Q. Who was there?—A. Moussa Bey.

Q. What was he doing?—A. He had a light in his hand; he burnt the hay.

Q. Was he alone?—A. His servants were with him.

Q. What was the distance from your rick to the burnt one? Was it far?—A. There was one rick between mine and Ohannes'. The ricks were in a row. Flames appeared.

Q. Was it near where you were?—A. Yes; I ran up at once.

Q. Was the store-house empty?—A. No. In the store-house were Ohannes' brother and a servant.

Q. What else was inside?—A. All sorts of things.

Q. What was burnt first?—A. First the store and then the hay.

Q. Where was Moussa Bey at the time, and what was the house made of?—A. Moussa Bey was then on horseback and had a light in his hand, with which he was setting the fire. The store-house had stone walls and a wooden ceiling.

Q. What was in it?—A. As far as I know, barley, straw, labourers' clothes, tools, &c., all destroyed. They say there was other property, but I don't know.

Q. Did Moussa Bey see you?—A. No; I did not show myself.

Q. Why?—A. I was afraid of him. I was not a donkey to have shown myself (laughter among the audience). Witness turned round to the audience and said, "What are you laughing at? He would have killed me. He has killed several people." (Sensation.) Previous to the President putting these last two questions, he asked the witness, "Was the store large?"—A. Yes.

Q. Did you see Moussa burn the store?—A. As soon as I saw the flame I ran up. Moussa Bey was saying, "Let us burn these ricks and go."

Q. You were the first to go?

Continuation of previous questions.

President.—Is there any hostility between this Moussa and Ohannes?—A. Who knows? Perhaps there was.

Q. Why?—A. Ohannes was a great man, and Keanaya.

Q. Were the servants on horseback? How many people did you see on horseback?—A. Yes; I saw Moussa Bey, Eumer Bey, Djezai Bey, and Chalow Mourad Bey on horseback.

Q. How were the others? Was there anybody else there?—A. Five or six servants on foot, but I did not see how many.

Public Prosecutor.—Let him say what was the colour of the horses.

President.—When there was such a flame, the scene must have been as clear as daylight. What did you see?—A. Moussa Bey's horse was white. The other horses were red.

Public Prosecutor.—What kind of red? Bay or chestnut? He stated the colour in the preliminary investigation.—A. Could not say.

The President considered the evidence on this point sufficient.

Public Prosecutor.—When he came to the fire did anybody else come?—A. I shouted to the village, and the villagers came.

Q. Let him say whether Moussa Bey ran away before or after the villagers came. At the interrogatory he made a positive statement on this point. What was the distance between the village and the rick?—A. Moussa Bey went away first. The village is three or four minutes' distance from the rick. On my shouting out the villagers came from all sides. I said, "His son and servant are inside; let us save them," and we at once set to work to do so.

President.—Did the villagers see Moussa Bey? Did any one see him besides yourself?—A. I went first, and afterwards Agop came.

Q. Where did you see Agop? Did he see Moussa Bey's arson?—A. Agop came after me. I only say what I saw myself. I don't know what Agop saw.

Q. Who was inside the store-house?—A. Ohannes and Kenias.

Q. Where are they now? What became of them?—A. One of them is here.

Q. What is his name?—A. Ohannes.

Q. What clothes did they wear, and when you got them out were they burnt?—A. They were shirts and drawers, labourers' dress.

Public Prosecutor.—Were their clothes completely burnt?—A. I don't know.

Q. Were their drawers and shirts burnt?—A. Yes.

Q. When a man's clothes are burning, to put out the flames they must pour water upon them, or roll them on the ground. Which did they do?—A. Could not say.

Q. This point must be carefully examined, because here is a contradiction. If it is disproved the accused will be condemned, and if it increases the accused will be acquitted?—A. We all crowded round them. I don't know how they put out the flames. I did not see. I know that much.

Q. What is the distance between Migherditch's rick and Ohannes'?—A. His rick was further off than mine.

Q. What was the distance between Migherditch's rick?—A. There are six ricks.

Q. Let him describe their position. Whose rick is at the top?—A. Ohannes'.

Q. Are the ricks in a row?

(Witness did not reply, except to repeat that Ohannes' rick was at the top.)

Public Prosecutor.—Did Migherditch or his brother see Moussa Bey?—A. I don't know.

Q. How is it that Boghos saw the fire before those who were in the other ricks? Was nobody watching Ohannes' rick?—A. They had cut the barley. Nobody was watching. There were labourers, who were tired, and went and slept in the store-house.

Q. Let him state the names of the owners of the ricks?—A. At the top, Ohannes, then Vartan's, then mine, then Agop's.

Q. Were there no more? Just now he said there were six?—A. There were so many.

Q. In the Instruction Department it was said that, in their village, there were sixty or seventy houses. Now he says there are only six?

(Agop's testimony was read, and was found to confirm the Public Prosecutor's statement. Boghos was asked about this contradiction. "How should I know? I did not count them.")

Public Prosecutor.—This is a great discrepancy?—A. My Lord, I did not count the ricks; they are in rows. In my row there are six. The village has four sides, and the ricks are round the village.

Q. Was Migherditch, the son of Ohannes, at the fire?—A. No; his father and brothers were there.

Q. Did he wake them up?—A. I don't know. I shouted, and they all came, and among them I saw Ohannes.

Q. Did Ohannes hear that the fire was put by Moussa Bey? What did he do?—A. Yes; he heard of it, and cried.

Q. As this witness knew more about the matter than anybody else, did he mention it, I wonder?—A. Yes; I did. I said Moussa Bey set the fire and went (according to another account, Boghos is represented to have said "The villagers said so," but I don't know who told it first).

Q. Did he hear any shots fired, and who fired them?—A. Yes; Moussa Bey fired.

Q. How many times, and when did he fire?—A. Four or five times after the villagers came.

Q. Just now he said that Moussa Bey went before the villagers came?—A. So he did; but he fired while going, afar off and in the air.

Izzet Effendi.—My Lord, was Moussa Bey going straight to the village? Did he fire in the village?

Question put.

Witness replies.—No; he did not fire in the village.

Public Prosecutor.—Where was Migherditch that night?—A. I did not see him; only his father, Ohannes, came.

Q. Was he at Stamboul?—A. At Bitlis.

Q. Was it a moonlight night?—A. There was no moon.

Public Prosecutor.—My Lord, let him fix the time and date of the occurrence.

Witness.—How do I know, my Lord. It was at night. I have no watch. The night of the 24th July.

Q. What was the day?—A. Thursday.

Izzet Effendi.—Allow me to put a question.

President.—I beg that we should not be occupied with trifles. Let only questions be asked such as will prove the truth.

Izzet Effendi.—My Lord, the charges against my client are very grave and serious. Consider the importance of the penalty that will be imposed if they are true.

Public Prosecutor.—Let him put his questions. Here everybody can protect his rights.

President.—Put your questions.

Izzet Effendi.—It is said that flames appeared. Was it smoke or sparks, or a flame?—*A.* It was a flame. The scene was as bright as daylight.

Izzet Effendi.—Boghos says he saw in Moussa Bey's hand lights; also that he saw other companions. All the villagers came. Two persons were saved from the fire. This is very strange. There were as much as 35 arabas of hay, straw, &c., burning, and the villagers did not do anything to put out the fire.

Boghos.—We all tried to save the servants.

Izzet Effendi.—He says that after Moussa Bey burnt the store-house; Eumer and Djezai Beys were there. What wast heir position; were they in a row? This point must be established. The penalty that may be inflicted on my client on this account is very grave. Had the others lights in their hands?—*A.* The four were in a row. There was a light in Moussa Bey's hand, but not in those of the others.

Public Prosecutor.—On which side of Eumer Bey was Moussa Bey? When they were going away, were they side by side, or did they go in single file.

No answer appears to have been given to those questions. The following is another account of Izzet Effendi's cross-examination.

First question.—Were the horses standing outside side by side.

Second question.—Boghos says: "I gave warning, and afterwards describes how the fire was set:" how can this be?—*A.* My Lord, I shouted out (gave warning), and, at the same time, went straight towards the smoke.

The President pointed out that the witness used the term "gave warning" in the sense of "shouted out," and that Izzet Effendi had misunderstood it.

Izzet Effendi.—The store-house was burnt. They arrive after such a conflagration, but no harm was done to the men except that their clothes were burnt. How is that?—*A.* I shouted out. The villagers came up at once and began to rescue them.

Q. Could they not get the fire under? What did they do for that purpose?—*A.* Sir, they did their best.

Moussa Bey.—My Lord, in our part of the country, at the time he speaks of, they don't store up straw. Then afterwards he says there were 1,000 arabas of straw. How can this be?

Witness.—In answer to the President's question on this point: The clover was fresh. The straw was old, last year's. Ohannes being a great man used to receive 500 or 600 loads of straw.

Izzet Effendi.—The witness says Moussa Bey set fire to the ricks. Let him describe the position of the horses.

Witness.—My Lord, it was night. I first saw Eumer Bey.

Izzet Effendi.—Was there any light in Moussa Bey's hand, or in that of any of the others?—*A.* I only saw a light in Moussa Bey's hand.

Public Prosecutor.—Did Eumer Bey and Moussa Bey stand near each other?—*A.* They stood in a row. They did not see me, but I saw them.

Mehemet Ali Effendi.—The witness says Moussa Bey's brother went into the straw stores. Why were his clothes not burnt?

Public Prosecutor.—You have misunderstood. That was said for Migherditch's brother. One of those in the store was Migherditch's brother. There is no contradiction.

Q. Did he or Agop come first? Did he talk to Agop?—*A.* Agop came after me. I did not talk to him.

Moussa Bey.—In our part of the country there are five months of winter. How could it be old straw?—*A.* My Lord, these are the chief persons in the village. They have much straw.

The President had the other witness, Agop, sent for.

Moussa Bey.—Boghos is my enemy, and his evidence is not acceptable.

Agop, a deaf old man, was then brought in, and, on account of his deafness, not hearing the President even when speaking loudly, was brought near him.

President.—What is your name? father's name and village?—*A.* Agop, son of Carabet, of Ardank.

Q. How old are you?—I'm past 60, 65, and 70.

Q. What is your business or occupation?—*A.* What can a man like me do, your Lordship? I am a labourer.

Q. There are various charges against Moussa Bey. Will you swear to tell the truth about what you know?

Witness sworn.

Q. It is said there was a fire. How did it happen?—*A.* I was sitting on my own rick. I saw smoke, went to that side, and afterwards there was a flame, first from the hay, and then from the granary. I saw three men on horseback and one on foot.

Public Prosecutor.—Who were they, and what were they doing?—Moussa Bey, Eumer Bey, and Djezai Bey, and their companions. They had lights in their hands, and were setting the fire. Moussa Bey threw a light into the hay. I shouted out "Fire," and the villagers came up, and Moussa Bey ran away.

President.—What light was thrown into the hay?—*A.* It was a match, and it fired the haystack. I did not see lights in the hands of anybody else. I don't know if there was anybody who saw this besides myself. We then heard three or four shots fired (according to another account two shots), but we did not see them.

Q. Are ricks near?—*A.* There are six ricks between mine and the burnt rick.

Q. Which burnt first of all? Where did you see the smoke come from?—*A.* From the straw store.

Public Prosecutor.—Let him state exactly how many men there were on horseback.—*A.* There were three.

President.—What was the colour of the horses?—*A.* One was white, and two were red.

Q. What did the villagers do when they came up?—*A.* A lot came. Moussa Bey ran away. We heard guns fired from afar.

Public Prosecutor.—Was there a light only in Moussa Bey's hand?—*A.* I saw matches both in Moussa Bey's and Eumer Bey's hands. They were lighting them.

Q. Let him state exactly whether he saw them in the hands of both, or of one only.—*A.* Of both.

Q. Was Moussa Bey there when the villagers came?—*A.* They were there, and went.

President.—Who fired a pistol?—*A.* They went far away, fired pistols, and I heard the noise.

Q. Where were the servants; in the straw store?—*A.* They were two, shut up inside.

Public Prosecutor.—Was the place shut from the inside?—*A.* Yes.

President.—What did they wear?—*A.* They had clothes on.

Q. Were their clothes burnt?—*A.* As far as I could see, they were not?

Q. How was that? Who got them out?—*A.* The villagers.

Q. Did you see Boghos?—*A.* Yes.

Q. Did he come before or after you?—*A.* I saw him there, but don't know whether he came before or after me.

Public Prosecutor.—Did you talk to Boghos?—*A.* Yes

Q. What did you say?—*A.* I don't know; we were anxious to save the hay.

Q. Did you say that Moussa Bey set the fire?—*A.* At that moment I did not say it, but afterwards I did.

Q. What were the names of the servants of the granary?—*A.* Keinus and Hovo (Ohannes). The latter was Ohannes' son, the other a servant.

Q. What was the distance between Migherditch's rick and Ohannes?—*A.* There are six ricks.

Q. Did Moussa Bey run away before or after the villagers?—*A.* The villagers came after they went.

Q. How many times did they fire?—*A.* I heard two shots.

Q. What were the lights in their hands?—Was it naptha, firewood, or a lamp?—*A.* No; only lighted matches.

Q. Did you see the fire yourself, or did you find it out through Boghos shouting?—*A.* I saw it myself.

President.—Was there moonlight?—*A.* No.

Q. Who told Migherditch's father that Moussa Bey had set the fire?—*A.* My Lord, the villagers told him, and I told him.

Public Prosecutor.—When?—*A.* Not then; but three or four days afterwards. I did not see him there before.

Izzet Effendi.—Ohannes gave a Petition when the event took place. Why did not he (the witness) show himself?

Public Prosecutor.—Whom else did he see?—*A.* The villagers I saw, Ohannes, and Carabet.

Q. What o'clock was it?—*A.* It was 3 or 4.

Q. What was the colour of the horses of Moussa and Eumer Beys?—*A.* Moussa's was white and Eumer's red.

(*Public Prosecutor* [*sic*].—This is at variance with witness' statement in the interrogatory.)

Public Prosecutor.—Did Boghos come to the place before you?—*A.* I don't know.

Q. You say you shouted out. Boghos shouted out, did he not?—*A.* Yes; we both shouted.

President.—I think this is enough for to-day.

Public Prosecutor.—My Lord, there is discrepancy in the evidence of the witnesses. They may compare their evidence outside. Let us continue a little longer, and let the hearing of the witnesses finish to-day.

The President.—As a matter of fact, this question won't finish in five or six sittings. They talk to each other and can do no harm, as hitherto they must have talked to each other long enough. Our residences are in different quarters.

Public Prosecutor.—The members of the Court may pass the night in Stamboul at friends' houses.

President.—The next sitting will be begun early.

The trial finished at 10·15 o'clock (Turkish time), and the Court adjourned till Tuesday.

[*To be continued.*]

(Signed) J. ALVAREZ.

November 25, 1889.

No. 97.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received December* 13.)

(No. 475.)

Constantinople, November 27, 1889.

My Lord,

WITH reference to my despatch No. 464 of the 22nd instant, I have the honour to transmit herewith a translation of the official Turkish judicial journal of the 23rd instant containing the official version of the indictment against Moussa Bey, as well as a Petition presented by him to His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, and other documents relating to the case.

I have also the honour to inclose a translation of the substance of the indictment which has appeared in the unofficial local paper, the "Turquie."

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 97.

Translation of Turkish Judicial Official Paper.

Unofficial Portion.

FOR some time back statements have been made in some quarters that atrocities have been perpetrated in the Sandjak of Moush, and that Moussa Bey was the premeditated and wilful perpetrator of such crimes. Seeing not only that the complaints on the subject have found their way into the public press, but that, moreover, representations of an exceptional character have been made to the Government, both on the part of the Sublime Porte and the Ministry of Justice, strict injunctions have been forwarded to proper officials that an equitable investigation of the facts should take place on the spot, the truth of the case be brought to light, and should the allegations prove true, that the law should take its course. Thereupon, as soon as it was ascertained from intelligence coming from the scene of these alleged crimes that Moussa Bey was absent, the necessary orders were issued for his arrest and committal

to the proper Court, while at the same time Ibrahim Bey Effendi was deputed to investigate the facts in the district of Moush. The latter, on his way, was met by Moussa Bey, who expressed his horror and astonishment that they were about to arrest and imprison him without trial, and declared his readiness to submit himself to any sort of properly-constituted and formal inquiry. He, moreover, maintained, we learn, that imputed charges would, on examination, prove utterly groundless and baseless. To insure an impartial and unbiassed investigation of the alleged crimes, free from influence and prejudice, it was considered proper to have him brought to Constantinople, and to have the trial take place here. Accordingly, orders were dispatched to Bitlis, and the accused was brought to Constantinople under a special escort. On his arrival he presented a Petition, of which the following is a verbatim copy, and which was published at the time in the public journals:—

Petition of Mousse Bey.

From childhood to the present day, both in war and in office, I have ever served the Imperial Government faithfully and generously, even at the risk of my life. Nevertheless, a set of fabrications, in which I am styled villain, and one notorious for such crimes, have been presented to my just and Imperial master. Yet, while never admitting any one of these fabrications, and ever anxious to come and present my case at the Imperial Throne, on the suggestion of His Sovereign Majesty, I have accepted and have come to seek refuge at the feet of the Sultan, the focus of justice. And if in this matter any subject of His Majesty has experienced wrong or injury, or claims to have so suffered, I present myself at the Imperial refuge of justice and dare to offer the vindication of my right, if I am implicated in any of these fabricated charges, to be punished accordingly; but, if my innocence is established, to have punishment inflicted on the fabricators for the imputed charges. In any eventuality, I abide by the Imperial pleasure.

Your servant,

(Signed) MOUSSA BEY (Son of Miza Bey).

From time immemorial, it has been the duty of the Imperial Government to see justice done to all classes of its subjects. Accordingly, seeing that the change of venue in the case of Moussa Bey may entail a lot of inconvenience on the accusers, and that, perhaps, owing to their poverty, they may be prevented from prosecuting their rights, orders have been issued that the travelling expenses of the accusers should, on their application, be defrayed out of the local Treasury. Also, Ibrahim Bey Effendi has been commissioned to find out and examine the authors of these charges, which, as special information would make believe, have been brought forward in a very vague manner, and, as soon as they are discovered, to hand the matter over at once to the Court of First Instance at Constantinople. Ibrahim Bey has forwarded four Reports, worded as follows, and setting forth all that he has done in the execution of his duty.

First Report of Ibrahim Bey Effendi, Member of the Court of Cassation, presented July 8, 1305.

Of the nine individuals who drew up a Petition against Moussa Bey to His Imperial Majesty, in the name of the Armenian population of the Kaza of Moush and the villages under its jurisdiction, eight have put in appearance, and, by way of preliminary inquiry, their statements have been noted down.

Of these, Khorshid Asadorian stated that last year, when he was in his native country, Moussa Bey had carried off ten oxen from a field of his brother Siroup, and, subsequently, when Siroup could not give 20*l.* to redeem the oxen, he had been beaten by Moussa Bey to such a degree that ten days after he died of fright. This he learned from those who had come from his country and contents of a letter received from his children. He declared that up to this he had not presented a Petition for fear of Moussa Bey, but that now he had presented it directly to His Majesty, but as he had not been eye-witness of facts, he could not by testimony prove charges; that, simply

relating his case to Ishak, who drew up the Petition, he had no authorization from the inhabitants to institute a charge on the other counts contained in the Petition.

Of the village Natauan, in the Kaza of Akhlat, a cobbler, Hazar Karabetian, and a labourer, Franos Ohannesian, and a labourer, Mikar Detch, son of Ibrahim, said that they had heard from various sources that two and a-half months before their relatives, Manok and Oglu Agop, had been murdered by Moussa Bey. The same witnesses said that the sons of the murdered men were going to Constantinople to make their Petition, and that they (the witnesses) had no power to act for these petitioners. One of the same witnesses, Franos, said that Moussa Bey had robbed him of twelve sheep and two cows, and that he had become a "partie civile" against Moussa Bey on that ground, that he had brought his complaint before the Kaïmakamlik of the district, but without result; that he had not seen Moussa Bey take his beasts, and therefore could not prove the robbery. Another witness, Uranos Hazarian, of the village Uzun, said that Moussa Bey had violated his daughter; that he might have brought his complaint before the local Court, but knew it would not be attended to; that he had come two years before to Constantinople and brought his case to the Patriarchate; that the Patriarchate had since sent him no satisfactory answer; that this complaint of his daughter's violation was not included in the Petition which had been presented, but that he was ready to present this further Petition; that, nevertheless, such outrages could not be proved by witnesses, and consequently he would not be able to show that Moussa Bey had done the act.

A stone-cutter, Mikar Detch Ohannesian, of the village Ardon, said that three years before his barns and hay in his native place had been burnt by Moussa Bey; that in the local inquiry the villagers had been afraid to appear, and consequently the inquiry had been without result; that afterwards Moussa Bey had taken from him 20 liras, and that one night Moussa Bey had bored a hole in the wall of his house and taken away property of the value of 3,500 piastres; that he himself was not able to prove these charges, but that his elder brother, Kirabet, would go to Constantinople to make his complaint against Moussa Bey.

Arsh Hazarian, native of Moush, living in service in Constantinople, said that he had no complaint against Moussa Bey; that his Petition had not been presented at the regular time; that he had gone as a spectator to the Selamlik, and seeing some Armenians there making Petitions had joined in their cries.

Arshak Hashourian, native of Moush, who has been a commission agent in Constantinople for the last year and a-half, said that he had suffered no direct injury from Moussa Bey, but that, by reason of Moussa Bey's acts, he had been unable to recover money due to him in Moush; that he derived his knowledge of the facts from persons who had suffered injury, and from Petitions to the Sublime Porte and to the Patriarchate.

Another petitioner, a porter (Musas), was called, but had changed his address, and could not be found, and no evidence was obtained from him.

Moussa Bey, on being questioned, denied the stories of the witnesses, and said that, till the time of Arif Pasha becoming Vali, he had lived on excellent terms with the Armenians, and that, in accordance with written requests of Armenians, he had been appointed Mudir of his district; that while he was Mudir a certain Armenian Papas, named Yarim, had gone about intriguing amongst the Armenians, and he had caused Yarim to be apprehended on evidence of one of those intrigues; that in consequence Armenian feeling had been excited, and these charges got up against him; that the daughter of Anko, of the village of Moushahan, had been driven out and abandoned by some Khoja before the war when she was 10 years old, and his (Moussa's) father, Mirza Khan, had caused the girl to be found and sent back to her father; as to Bostourian Aukhan, of Arghwan, he had been killed by a thunderbolt while he (Moussa) was at Bitlis under orders from the Grand Vizier, and he had heard that it had been so decided by the local Court; and as to the daughter of the shopkeeper Miro, of the village of Hars, he had not abducted her, but she had, two years before, of her own free will, married Jezair Bey, his brother, and had adopted Islam, and was living at present as the wife of the said Jezair Bey; and as to Agho, it had been proved from the inquiries instituted by the Moush Courts of Justice, that he had died a natural death, and the charge of having murdered Agho's son and stolen his property was equally groundless, and Ohannes, of the village of Arbank, had brought his complaint before the Moush Tribunal, and the truth would be ascertained there. In fine, Moussa said that all the charges against him were baseless.

It appears from the foregoing examination, that of the nine persons presenting the aforesaid Petitions, one has changed his residence, so that his evidence cannot be obtained, five are unprovided with the necessary powers of attorney, or cannot be "parties civiles," and the evidence of these five is not clear or trustworthy, and comes to nothing.

Khorshid Asadorian and Isanos Hazarian, and the stone-cutter, Mikar Detch Ohannesian, are entitled from facts which they allege to be "parties civiles" against Moussa Bey, but bring forward no sufficient evidence of these facts to prove the falsehood of his denial of them, while the remainder of their Petition does not show any further damage done to the petitioners. The evidence of Arshak, who said he had suffered no direct injury from Moussa Bey, but that he could not recover sums due to him from inhabitants of Moush by reason of the robberies and murders committed by Moussa Bey, is unworthy of attention, and seems to have been given merely in order to increase the number of petitioners against Moussa.

The alleged crimes are of course being inquired into by the local authorities, who will arrive at a decision on each one of them. Whether Moussa Bey is guilty or innocent, and whether the investigation by the local Courts is sufficient, are the questions submitted to his Highness the Grand Vizier. Inclosed herewith are thirteen pages of depositions and the annexed documents.

Second Mazkara, submitted August 23, 1305.

The first Mazkara, inclosing complaints against Moussa Bey, has arrived at Constantinople within this week.

The petitioner Miro from the village of Hars, in the district of Moush, declared that on a night in March, in the year 1305, Moussa Bey came to the village where petitioner lives, and shot dead petitioner's father Agop, aged 70, and broke the arm of petitioner's wife, and abducted Bakara, aged 14, the daughter of his brother, and stole cash and property to the amount of 3,000 liras. Petitioner produced witnesses, Wafan, Bedo, and Kiraghoz, who said they had seen Moussa Bey murder Agop. Moussa Bey, on the other hand, declared that Agop died a natural death.

[It is humbly requested (?) of his Highness the Grand Vizier, that he will cause a telegram to be sent to the Public Prosecutor at Moush, ordering him to transmit here the Report of the circumstances of Agop's death (?)].

Third Mazkara, dated August 26, 1305.

(After referring to the contents of the first and second Mazkara.)

Until the arrival of the Report referred to at the end of the second Mazbata, there is no further step to be taken, so far as the preliminary examination is concerned, in the case of the murder of Agop, or in those of the other nine petitioners, and the further proceedings will take their course according as a "Juge d'Instruction" decides, whether these cases are to be brought to trial or not. Accordingly, the documents containing the complaint and evidence of Miro are sent herewith to be placed in the hands of the Public Prosecutor of the Court of First Instance in Constantinople.

The preliminary examination of the complaints addressed by Makaryo Ali Aga to the Ministry of Justice (?) will be commenced to-day, and after the completion of the preliminary examination of these complaints, and of any others which may be brought forward, these cases too will be put in the hands of the aforesaid Public Prosecutor.

Fourth Mazkara, dated August 28, 1305.

Makarji Ali Aga, of Diarbekir, declared that Moussa Bey had robbed him of cash and personal property to the amount of 200 liras, and that he had brought his complaint before the Court of the Vilayet of Bitlis without result. Moussa denied the charge. Ali Aga produced Manok and Usub, witnesses of the robbery. There appeared to be discrepancies in the details of the evidence given by these witnesses, and the examination was closed.

The case of one Tino, who said that Moussa Bey had robbed him of sheep, and had wounded him with a gun-shot, and the case of Ohan and his wife, Gulnzar, who said their hay had been burnt and their property stolen by Moussa Bey, have been

referred to in our third Mazkara, and have been put in the hands of the Public Prosecutor to be brought before the "Juge d'Instruction" in Constantinople. In the cases of another Gulazar, alleged to have been carried off to the mountains and forced to marry Moussa Bey's brother, and of the robbery of twelve sheep and two cows, property of Iranok, of the village Natuan, and of the murder of Iranok's father and brother in the same village, in all these cases the complainants, though repeatedly summoned, have failed to appear before us.

The cases in which our preliminary inquiry has been completed now pass into the hands of the Public Prosecutor, but we will endeavour to facilitate the inquiry by the "Juge d'Instruction" by any other means which it is in our power to use. In the cases referred to, viz., those of Miro, of Khorshid Asadorian, of Iranos Hazarian, of the stone-cutter, Mikar Detch Ohannesian, of Timo, of Makarji Ali, and of the other Iranos, the preliminary examination has been completed. The complaints of Gilaghoz, of Murad, and of Komush have also been sent to the office of the Public Prosecutor. The Public Prosecutor has duly set on foot the subsequent inquiries. Considering the extraordinary importance attached to the case, we have thought it advisable to begin to-day to publish in full all the documents in it.

Following is a Declaration made on the 8th September, 1305, by the plaintiff, Khorshid Asadorian, of village of Tetuan, in Kaza of Akhbat (Bitlis Vilayet), who gives himself out as a labourer, residing at Pera, in Bagahcli Han, at Papasskeupri.

Q. How long have you been in Stamboul?—*A.* I've been here for three years.

Q. During that period, have you ever gone to your native place?—*A.* No.

Q. What charge do you bring against the Kurd, Moussa Bey?—*A.* About fourteen and a-half months ago, one evening near 8 or 9 o'clock, my eldest brother, Siroup, and my young brother, Kywick, were ploughing with ten oxen in the field, when Moussa Bey came up with ten horsemen and carried off the oxen. My brother, Siroup, went after him, and when he arrived in Moussa Bey's village, said to him, "My oxen have come here; hand them over to me." Moussa Bey replied, "Give me 20 liras and I'll find your oxen and give them to you." Siroup answered, "If I've got 20 liras, all right, I take the ten oxen. My oxen are in your stable; come, let me take them." Thereupon Moussa Bey got his men to beat Siroup. My brother then left the place. Moussa sent some men after him to kill him, but as some people joined him on the road they could not do so. Five days after he came to his village he died of fright. This is my charge, and my only charge.

Q. At that time you were in Constantinople. How do you know that the facts took place in that way?—*A.* People coming from the place told me about it.

Q. Have you got friends there?—Yes.

Q. Did you bring an action in the province?—*A.* Whom was I to bring an action against? He was the Pasha; he was the Kaimakam.

Q. Did you report the matter to the authorities? Has your brother been examined?—*A.* We did not report it to the authorities. My brother has not been examined.

Q. Is there any one who saw your brother's oxen taken by Moussa Bey, and saw the latter have your brother beaten?—*A.* The oxen were taken at Dogh Bashi, and my brother was beaten at Moussa Bey's village. Even if there were any eye-witness from Moussa Bey's village, he wouldn't say so.

Q. How are you going to prove that the oxen were taken and your brother beaten?—*A.* I have no witness; how am I to prove it?

Q. Sign this declaration.—*A.* I sign. I have a seal.

(Signed) HUSSU SADAKI.
AHMED.
KHORSHID ASADORIAN.

Declaration of Moussa Bey, taken September 11, 1305.

Q. State your name, father's name, age, and native place?—*A.* My name is Moussa Bey; my father's name, Miza Bey. I was born in Jinyar, in the Sandjak of Moush. I am 34 or 35 years of age. Have been Mudir for a time, and gain my living by farming tithes.

Q. Are you married? Have you any children? How many? Have you any

real property?—*A.* I am married, have three wives, four children (two sons and two daughters), and own five farms and a house.

Q. What's the distance between Tetuan and your village?—*A.* About fifteen hours' distance. Tetuan is in Sandjak of Bitlis. Our village is in Sandjak of Moush.

Q. It is alleged that some fourteen and a-half months ago you went one day, with ten horsemen, to Tetuan, and seized ten oxen belonging to Siroup, who were ploughing in his field?—*A.* I came here six months ago. A year before that, by order of Sublime Porte, I was in Bitlis with my wife and family. I never left Bitlis, as the Vali Pasha would not give me leave. Thus there is no ground for this charge, and I did not take the oxen.

Q. Did you never leave Bitlis?—*A.* This spring I went to Koi. My family remained in Bitlis. I received the tithes of the Caza of Koi. After that, on orders from here, I came to Stamboul.

Q. The brother of Siroup states that, when you had taken the oxen, Siroup went to your village; that you beat him because he demanded back the oxen, and that he died from fear that you would send some one to murder him on his return to his village?—*A.* No such thing ever happened. If it did, there is a Mudir there, a Mutessarif, a Vali; they would know about it.

Q. If you never took the man's oxen, why should he bring an action against you?—*A.* This Khorshid has been for five or six years in Stamboul. If such a thing happened, either he would bring an action before local authorities, or immediately after the event would bring an action before the authorities here.

Q. Has he brought such action?—*A.* Now for the first time I hear of it. There is no such charge. He has no grudge against me, and has been urged on to it by other parties.

Q. When did you go to Bitlis with your family?—*A.* Last spring, in the end of March. I changed my residence from Moush to Bitlis.

Q. Sign this declaration.—*A.* I have a seal.

(Signed) MOUSSA SAHBI. (?)
HUSSU SADAKI.
AHMED.

Decision.

This Declaration has been examined.

Whereas in the interrogatory instituted with regard to the accused, the Kurd, Moussa Bey, 35 years of age, of Junja, in Sandjak of Moush, on a charge of having, some fifteen months ago, seized the oxen of one Siroup, the brother of Khorshid Asadorian, of the village of Tetuan, and of having subsequently, by pursuit and beating, frightened to death the same Siroup; the plaintiff, Asadorian, stating that, inasmuch as he has no eye-witness of his asserted seizure, beating, and frightening, he cannot prove the charge by producing witnesses; and as, owing to the matter not having been reported to the local authorities, his brother has not been examined, no proof of any kind is adduced against the denial of Moussa Bey; and, whereas the charge rests solely on the statement of the complainant Khorshid, in accordance with the 123rd clause of the temporary (?) Law of the Criminal Courts, no trial shall be granted against Moussa Bey.

2 *Safer*, 1307 (*September* 16, 1305).

Declaration taken on the 7th September from the Complainant, Iranoss Hazarian, of the Village of Izut, in the Sandjak of Moush, of no fixed Employment, and residing in Bujuk Vezoi Han.

Q. How long have you been in Constantinople?—*A.* Two years and a-half.

Q. During that period have you visited your native place?—*A.* No.

Q. What is your charge against Moussa Bey?—*A.* About two years ago I was in my country. I don't know which month it was. One day Moussa Bey sent one of his men named Mardinoss. Mardinoss came to me; "Moussa Bey wants you," he said. I arose and went, and my son Khashik came with me. Moussa said to me, "You have been complaining against me." "God forbid!" I replied; "I never complained." "You will remain here to-night," he said. I remained in the room of the

Ketkyuda (Kyaya). That night I was guest in the room of the Kyaya Poli [?]. In the morning I went to Moussa Bey. "I am going," I said. "Go," he replied. I went home. My wife then said to me, "Last night Moussa Bey came, knocked at the door, and entered. Two servants held me while Moussa Bey violated our daughter." I reflected; "I am afraid to report the matter to the authorities. I pay 5,000 piastres a-year in taxes. My honour is gone. I can no longer stay in this country." Then I left my country and came here, while my family remained there.

Q. According to your declaration, you did not report the matter to the local authorities.—*A.* No; I did not. I was afraid he would kill me.

Q. How are you going to prove that Moussa Bey violated your daughter?—*A.* It was night. I have no one but God to prove it.

Q. What is your daughter's name? How old is she?—*A.* Her name is Onouder. She is 18 years of age. When Moussa Bey violated her she was married. Her husband's name is Hama; he is living in the village of Karis.

Q. You have reflected a long time about the name of your son-in-law?—*A.* I forgot his name, and reflected till I remembered it.

Q. If your son-in-law is in Karis, it is only natural that your daughter should be there also. According to your statement, Moussa Bey violated her in your house. How was it that she was there?—*A.* Three days before the event I sent for her. Her husband remained in his village.

Q. What is the distance between your village and Moussa Bey's village?—*A.* About three-quarters of an hour.

Q How did Moussa Bey know that your daughter was in your house?—*A.* Moussa is always coming and going in our village.

Q. Have you any other charge against Moussa Bey?—*A.* Yes.

Q. What is it?—*A.* Three years ago Moussa Bey built a kiosk on the village pasture-ground. At the time I was village Kyaya. He asked me for ten workmen; I sent him ten villagers. They worked sixty days, and he never gave them a farthing wages. They had to find even their own bread.

Q. What are the names of the labourers you sent?—*A.* They were village folk. But ten did not work continuously. They took it in turns, ten one day and ten the next; and thus for sixty days, every day ten worked.

Q. Are you authorized to prosecute the claims for wages of these men who worked for Moussa?—*A.* No.

Q. Have you any other charge?—*A.* Every year Moussa Bey employed 100 carts and 200 men in the fields and in collecting the leaves, and never paid a day's wages.

Q. Have you been delegated by the village people to bring claims against Moussa Bey?—*A.* Not in writing.

Q. Any other charge?—*A.* No.

Q. Sign this.—*A.* I sign.

(Signed) AHMED.
HUSSU SADAKI.
(Signature in Armenian.)

Interrogatory of Accused, Moussa Bey.

Q. What is your name, your father's name, and your age?—*A.* My name is Moussa Bey; my father's name, Miza Bey. I was born in Jinyar, in the Sandjak of Moush. I am 35 or 36 years old, was for a time Mudir, and live by farming the tithes.

Q. Are you married? Any children? How many? Have you any landed property?—*A.* I am married; have three wives, two sons, and two daughters. I have five farms and one horse.

Q. How far is Izut from your village?—*A.* It is an hour and a-half distant. Real name is Uzut.

Q. Do you know Iranoss Hazarian, of Uzut?—*A.* I do.

Inclosure 2 in No. 97.

Translation from "Turquie" of November 26, 1880.

IN the Criminal Division of the Court of Appeal, the President, Hussein Ruchdi Effendi, and the Judges Nechet and Haidar Effendis, composing the Court of "Mises en Accusation," being present in the Court-room, together with Reouf Bey, substitute for the Public Prosecutor in the Court of Appeal, Memdouh Bey, Clerk of the Court, read out the statement of the Public Prosecutor in the Court of Appeal of the 15th Rebi-ul-Ewel, 1307, and the 28th October, 1305, No. 5040, in opposition to the decision of the examining Magistrate ("Juge d'Instruction") of Stamboul, of the statements of the Public Prosecutor of Stamboul, and of the plaintiff, Migherditch Ohannesian, against the said decision, and other documents, all of them annexed to the first document, and deposited in the said Criminal Division. These papers were shown to have been presented within the term prescribed by the law.

The decision, apparent from these documents, is in substance as follows:—

The Kurd, Moussa Bey, is charged—

1. With having proceeded to the village of Ardank, in the Sandjak of Moush, and there burnt a barn containing agricultural instruments, clothes, and other effects, as well as piles of wood and instruments for chopping straw and grinding barley, lying outside, the whole being the property of Migherditch, son of Ohannes.

2. With having entered the latter's house by breaking in the wall, stolen his effects, demanded and obtained by violence the sum of 20*l.*, after having bound and threatened the elder brother of the said Migherditch.

It appears from the examination that the depositions made on this matter are contradictory and inaccurate.

In a statement by the substitute for the Public Prosecutor at Bitlis of the 30th August, 1305, it is alleged that Ohannes, the father of the said Migherditch, had previously had recourse to the authorities of Moush, to whom he had declared that the barn for housing straw had been burnt with all its contents at the instigation of Moussa Bey or of Suleiman Bey, his relative, on the night of the 10th July, 1303, but that he had been unable to prove that the barn had been burnt at the instigation of the said Beys. Migherditch now maintains that Moussa Bey in person set fire to the barn and mills. He endeavours to prove this charge by means of witnesses he has procured. He declares that he saw with his own eyes Moussa Bey light the fire, whereas on the night of the fire he was at Bitlis.

The above having shown the character of the charge, and contradictory depositions being inadmissible as legal proofs, it has been decided to dismiss the charge against Moussa Bey.

The indictment of the Public Prosecutor of Stamboul is in substance as follows:—

Although it has been decided to dismiss the charge against Moussa Bey, basing this decision on the ground that the depositions of the witnesses taken and recorded in the course of the inquiry opened on the charges of arson with malice aforethought, and of robbery made against Moussa Bey by Migherditch, son of Ohannes, having appeared contradictory, this point can only be judged by the competent authority, the above-mentioned decision ought to have been annulled [*sic*], inasmuch as it is not in conformity with the law.

In his demurrer (opposition) Migherditch Ohannesian maintains that the decision of the Stamboul examining Magistrate is illegal. He demands that it shall be quashed, and claims a full inquiry, in order that he may be heard as plaintiff.

In his "acte d'opposition," the Public Prosecutor in the Court of Appeal says in substance as follows:—

Although the depositions of the witnesses are contradictory, and that the nature of the charges made by Migherditch, who regards himself as plaintiff, and who has signed as prosecutor the demand containing his demurrer to the decision of the examining Judge, establishes the futility of his claim. Nevertheless, as it is equally stated in the demurrer of the Public Prosecutor in the Court of First Instance, the right of judging belongs to the competent Court, and inasmuch as, according to the declarations made, the act of Moussa Bey rendering him liable to the heaviest penalty falls under the provisions of Article 163 of the Penal Code, I oppose the decision to discuss the charge (*non-lieu*). I demand that it shall be quashed, and that the charge against Moussa Bey shall be proceeded with, as also the overruling of the objection to the signature by the said Migherditch of his demurrer as prosecutor, on the ground that such demurrer is not authorized by law.

After examining the remaining documents, the substitute for the Public Prosecutor repeated the substance of the above-mentioned demurrer, and the Clerk of the Court handed over all the documents to the "Chambre des Mises en Accusation" (Court of Indictments).

The latter, after deliberation, resolved that—

Whereas, although Migherditch has demurred to the decision, he has stated in his signature at the foot of his demurrer his capacity as prosecutor, and therefore has no legal ground for demurring:

Whereas, in the sentence of dismissal of the charges pronounced in the trial of the prisoner, Moussa Bey, the examining Judge acted contrary to law in pretending to judge the evidence, a function belonging to the Court; and whereas the Public Prosecutor in the Court of First Instance and Court of Appeal have objected:

And whereas, the acts mentioned are sufficient to justify the indictment of the prisoner Moussa Bey; and whereas the charge rendering him liable to the heaviest penalty is one of the crimes provided for by Article 163 of the Penal Code:

Therefore, it is decided unanimously on the 17th Rebu-il-Ewel, 1307, and the 30th October, 1305 [*sic*]—

To quash the demurrer of the said Migherditch.

To overrule the said decision in conformity with the objections of the Public Prosecutor.

To indict and arrest the said Moussa Bey, in conformity with the provisions of the Articles of chap. ii of Book IV of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

In consequence of these decisions, a warrant for arrest was issued and sent to the proper authority, together with the previous papers on the subject.

The indictment, which is short, is a mere repetition of the above-mentioned report.

The "Hakikat," in its issue of yesterday, states that it discusses the Moussa Bey trial instead of the attacks of the Hellenic press, adding that no one need be surprised at this, as the Moussa Bey question, which, like that of Crete, only had a local importance, has become famous, and that an attempt has even been made to invest it with a political character. It has been pretended that the defendant in this case enjoyed such protection as to render him safe from prosecution. Moussa Bey, by coming forward spontaneously and declaring that he was ready to be judged by the Tribunals if there were any plaintiffs against him, has annihilated all these malevolent insinuations, and the fact of Moussa Bey being tried by the Criminal Court proves how calumnious these assertions were. The Turkish paper says that it was precisely because Moussa's name was in every mouth that so many Europeans and correspondents of European newspapers were present at the Criminal Court. The result of the trial cannot be prejudged, however, even admitting that the charges of murder, rapine, &c., brought against Moussa Bey, are proved: are not monsters who have committed crimes of this nature often to be found in the most civilized countries? Were Moussa Bey, who is now being tried publicly, to be acquitted to-morrow, what would not the feeling of shame be of those who have published so many articles about him? If, on the contrary, he be condemned, he will be punished as common criminals are who commit outrages, rapine, murder, &c. In the latter case also, those same persons who have filled the columns of the foreign newspapers with their writing will experience the same feeling of shame when they see that the Imperial Government has denied in a signal manner that it does not grant its protection to criminals of this class. And the "Hikakat" concludes by remarking, "That is the reason why every one follows with interest the trial which is, whilst we write, taking place in the Criminal Court."

No. 98.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received December* 13.)

(No. 477. Secret and Confidential.)

Constantinople, November 29, 1889.

My Lord,

WITH reference to my despatch No. 463, Secret, of the 22nd instant, I have the honour to inclose herewith a copy of a Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez, reporting a confidential conversation he had with the Minister of Police on the question of the imprisonment of Moussa Bey, and of the presence on the Bench at his trial of Ahmed Pasha, "Chef du Bureau Politique" at the Palace.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 98.

Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez.

(Secret and Confidential.)

I CALLED on the Minister of Police, his Excellency Kiamil Bey, this morning, in order to find out whether Moussa Bey had been removed to the Central Prison in Stamboul or Ministry of Police, as the Grand Vizier on Jevdet Pasha's authority informed you the day before yesterday. I also saw in the "Tarik" of yesterday a statement to the effect that Moussa Bey had been conveyed at a late hour to the Ministry of Police, after the conclusion of the session of Tuesday. The Minister confirmed the statement made in the "Tarik" on that point, and said that about half-past 11 *à la Turque*, or perhaps a little earlier, one of his subordinates came to him, and, informing him of Moussa Bey's arrival, on behalf of Bahri Pasha, recommended him to his protection, and asked that comfortable quarters should be assigned to him. The Minister declined to give him any countenance, and remarked, "People who are accused of criminal offences must not expect to be comfortably installed at the Ministry of Police as if it were one of the Pera hotels. I have no objection to his occupying the quarters of the Police Commissioner, who is on duty for the night, but he must be well guarded."

Since Tuesday, Moussa Bey has been detained in the Ministry of Police when not before the Court undergoing his trial, as he should have been ever since the Chamber of Accusation decided that there was a case against him.

Kiamil Bey told me also that after hearing from me on Monday afternoon that Ahmed Pasha, "Chef du Bureau Politique" to the Sultan, had attended at the first sitting of the trial of Moussa Bey, he had at once reported the circumstance to His Imperial Majesty, asking at the same time whether he had attended by Imperial order or not, as the presence of Ahmed Pasha had excited remark on the part of the Dragomans of Embassies and Legations present, and attracted the attention of the audience, whereby apprehension of the exercise of improper influence on, and even of intimidation of, the Judges might be raised.

His Majesty, he said, was exceedingly angry, and at once inquired by whose orders Ahmed Pasha had attended at the trial. The Minister had reason to believe that on Tuesday evening or on Wednesday morning Ahmed Pasha was, as it were, placed under arrest, and that would account for Ahmed Pasha's absence at yesterday's hearing of the case. This arrest, the Minister thinks, will probably last at least five or six days, and he will keep me informed as far as he can of the details of the inquiry. Sureya Pasha, His Majesty's Chief Secretary, is appointed to conduct the inquiry, and this will, I think, insure the matter being properly sifted.

The naval officer, Captain Ahmed Bey, has also been reprimanded on suspicion of attempting to influence the Judges, and most likely will not attend to-morrow's sitting.

Tewfik Pasha is too honest and upright to excite any suspicion, and I should hope to hear no more about the possibility of any undue influence being brought to bear upon the Court.

I should mention that not only on this but on previous occasions I have had interesting conversations with Kiamil Bey. Owing to his marriage with the daughter of the Chief of the Clan Kartuschy (Kurds) he has considerable influence in Kurdistan, and has a thorough acquaintance with that savage country, gained when he was an officer in the army. He was at one time Kaimakam of what is now the Mutessariflik of Hekkiari, with a population of nearly 300,000 souls under his jurisdiction. The Armenians say of him, "Before Kiamil Effendi came, notwithstanding all the Imperial Firmans issued, we never knew what the Tanzimat was;" and he describes Mar Schimun, the Nestorian Patriarch, as having great respect for him, and habitually corresponding with him. *Inter alia*, he stated that Mar Schimun had begun to complain in secret of the attitude of the English missionaries in this country. When at Hekkiari the Sultan heard of him through the secret reports of His Majesty's spies, and had him brought to Constantinople.

Kiamil Bey imagined he had committed some offence, or had done something to incur the Imperial displeasure, and expected to be sent into exile or dismissed. He was surprised to see that His Majesty had formed a favourable opinion of him, and more as to see himself one of the Secretaries at the Palace. He was then employed for the arrest of the Kurdish Sheikh Ubeydullah, and, as a reward for his success, named Minister of Police. The other day, while discussing Moussa Bey's case, he

told me something that reminded me of the raids of the Highland caterans on the Lowlanders in Scotland, or the old border forays, and at the same time shows what goes on in Kurdistan at this day, even in the nineteenth century. None of the Valis or Government officials, who are sent from the capital, and only remain a few years in the country, are aware of the existence of a very curious custom. The Chief of the clan invariably receives from his vassals, Christian as well as Mussulman, a yearly tribute, which, on account of the scarcity of money, is usually paid in kind. This is called "Vergheel," and is quite independent of the local Government taxation. As long as this tribute is paid, the vassal is entitled to the support and protection of his Chief. Should his oxen or other animals and property be driven away or stolen by members of another clan, the vassal forthwith proceeds to the dwelling of his Chief, and, driving his staff into the ground, claims the value of the stolen property. The Chief is bound either to indemnify the man on the spot, or to call the tribe together and organize an expedition to punish the offenders. If anybody is killed there forthwith springs up a blood-feud. Should the vassal fail to pay this tribute or black-mail, the Chief is entitled, according to the unwritten Kurdish law, to ravage his lands, and in other ways to compel him to submit. This state of things, when they happen to be aware of it, Government officials are powerless to prevent. Kiamil Bey is himself an example of this. About eighteen years ago he had large property not far from the scene of Moussa Bey's exploit (in which, by-the-bye, he thoroughly believes, as he knows from sources official and unofficial that Moussa Bey is an utter scoundrel), and one year, not having paid the usual black-mail, his Chief, Tafer Bey, notwithstanding it was the depth of winter, harried and ravaged his lands, carrying off nearly 1,000 animals, sheep, oxen, cows, horses, &c.

(Signed) J. ALVAREZ.

November 29, 1889.

No. 99.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received December 13.)

(No. 478.)
My Lord, *Constantinople, December 3, 1889.*

WITH reference to my telegram of the 2nd instant, I have the honour to transmit herewith a translation of the Judgment pronounced by the Criminal Court of Appeal in the Moussa Bey case yesterday.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 99.

Judgment pronounced by the Criminal Court of Appeal in Moussa Bey's Case, as given in the "Tarik" of December 3, 1889.

(Translation.)

AFTER hearing the claims and replies of the parties, and after perusal and examination of the documents of the investigation, the case was deliberated upon; and, as will be shown in the detailed record of the proceedings and in the Judgment to be drawn up, considering that the evidence given respecting the acts which are laid to the charge of the accused, Moussa Bey, is conflicting, and therefore cannot be looked upon as quite sufficient to satisfy the conscience. On the charge of arson and extortion he is acquitted, as there was not a majority, and on the charge of burglary, as there was no unanimity; and as to the charge of the murder of Malkhass, as the majority of two-thirds on the point of his criminality could not be obtained, he was acquitted, and decision given for his release, if he is not under arrest for another charge.

9 *Rebi-ul-Akher*, 1307 (*November* 20, 1889).

No. 100.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received December 13.)

(No. 480.)
My Lord *Constantinople, December 4, 1889.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 474 of the 27th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit copy of a further full Report, by Mr. Alvarez, of the continuation of the trial of Moussa Bey.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 100.

Continuation of Mr. Alvarez' Report.

ON Tuesday I attended at the Criminal Court of Appeal shortly after 11 o'clock, but the Court did not sit till about 12. The Court-room was, as before, densely packed, though not to the same extent as on the previous occasion. M. Dimitriades, Dragoman of the American Legation, attended, M. Gargiulo being unable to be present. The same Palace functionaries who came on Saturday were present to-day (Tuesday). On entering the Court, I noticed that M. Ledoulx, French Dragoman of Embassy, was present, and, subsequently, M. Marghetich, Dragoman of the Belgian Legation, came in and heard most of the case. The audience was much quieter, and listened to the proceedings with unflagging interest. As on the previous occasion, a large number of persons had to be refused admittance, and expressed their disappointment as before.

The Court was composed of the same members who sat on the previous occasion, with the exception of Tahsin Effendi, who was replaced by Salih Bey. Assaf Pasha Lavé, the Public Prosecutor (Khaled Bey), the Clerk of the Court (Azmy Bey), with the lawyers, Simon Tinghir Effendi and Izzet and Mehmet Ali Beys, were also present. Moussa Bey was in the dock.

Although, in reply to the telegram sent by Simon Tinghir Effendi, plaintiff's lawyer, the power of attorney, which it was said would be sent, was received from the plaintiff Ohannes by telegraph, it appears it was not couched in the usual and proper form required by law, and the Public Prosecutor, to whom it had been previously shown in the Judges' room, and who then pointed out its inacceptability, repeated that it could not be accepted. Thereupon, Simon Effendi presented a Petition from Carabet, son of Ohannes, who maintained that Moussa Bey bound him, in order to obtain 20 liras by force from him. This was seen to be in perfect order, and Simon Tinghir Effendi was declared his representative, with the usual formalities, after Carabet's identity had been duly established by the two witnesses from Ardank who were examined on Saturday, viz., Boghos and Agop. By the President's orders, the various documents, such as the act of accusation, &c., and *procès-verbal* of the previous sitting, were read, for the information of Salih Bey, who had not been present. I listened most attentively, and was glad to notice that hardly any points in the case, although a very lengthy one, had been omitted, whereas I had remarked important omissions in the reports of two of the leading Turkish papers, the "Tarik" and the "Sandet." After its perusal, the President inquired of all the parties in the case whether there was any exaggeration or omission. The plaintiff's lawyer had no objections to make. The defendant's lawyer said the only omission noticeable was the absence of Moussa Bey's statement, when under examination, that he was at Moush at the time of the fire. The Public Prosecutor said—when the witness for the arson, Agop, said he saw Moussa and Emmer Beys at the fire—the name "Jezay" was inserted in the *procès-verbal*. Then Agop said, "I saw and talked to Boghos;" while in the *procès-verbal* no mention of the talk is made. I see no other errors. After a slight discussion these corrections were made.

Mehmet Ali Effendi, on behalf of Moussa Bey, rose, and by permission of the President, who had first recommended him to reserve his remarks when speaking for the defence, proceeded to attack the evidence of the two witnesses:—

"Article 270 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, in its middle paragraph, gives a wide authority to the lawyers of the accused, and at this point I am obliged to make

use of these rights and authority, and to say what may serve as the basis for the defence, in opposition to the persons and evidence of witnesses, once they have been examined."

President.—Proceed.

"My Lord, before objecting to the evidence of the witnesses, profiting by Articles 268 and 269 of the Law on Criminal Procedure, I make the following objections against the persons of the witnesses. Boghos and Agop, who gave evidence about the arson, have a secret enmity to my client on account of the priest, and have been for the past four years presenting petitions, citations, and Mazbatas to the administrative and civil officials of the Mutessarifate of Moush and Vilayet of Bitlis, and have been telegraphing to high quarters, thereby plainly showing their hostility, and therefore their evidence has no weight at all against my client, and is valueless in the eye of the law. Let us come to the evidence of these witnesses. The objection that will be made to their evidence consists in showing your honourable Court that the witnesses contradict and conflict with one another and with the deposition of Migherditch, who was called a plaintiff, and who was rejected in that capacity. To do so it is requisite to enumerate, in the first place, Migherditch's conflicting statements; and, secondly, the contradictory character of the witnesses' evidence. Taking this as a basis, I should first submit the contradictory nature of Migherditch's depositions. Notwithstanding that Migherditch himself suffered no damage, had no personal claim of any kind, and did not produce any official power of attorney on behalf of his father, he makes his appearance in the manner described by my client when under examination, and represents the case of arson which is laid to the charge of Moussa Bey in the following manner before the Judge of Instruction. Three years ago, one night about 6 o'clock, while sleeping in his own house, he was informed by Boghos, a villager of his village, that there was a fire. He awoke and went to the granary, declared he saw it burning, and Moussa Bey with his associates, arms in hand, blockading the granary and preventing the extinction of the fire, and that the hay, straw, and clothes, with other property kept there, as if they were afraid brigands would come down upon them and pillage their houses, were burnt, as well as three stacks of hay and one stack of wood, and thirty-five arabas of barley which were in the granary were also burnt; that Boghos and Agop of the same village were eye-witnesses of the setting of the fire by Moussa Bey, but notwithstanding that they informed the local authorities at the time, the villagers, being afraid of Moussa Bey, would not give evidence. This was the statement he made to the Judge of Instruction in the first interrogatory, and that made to his Excellency Ibrahim Bey, member of the Court of Cassation, is in contradiction to it, as it is therein stated 'that he was at Bitlis on the night when the granary was burnt, and did not know the names of those who saw Moussa Bey set the fire.'

"On being asked by the Judge of Instruction to explain this contradiction, he gave the contradictory answer, 'that as a matter of fact he was at Bitlis on the night of the fire, and though he did not see that Moussa Bey set the fire, by mistake he said the contrary, and the villagers and his brother Carabet saw those who set the fire.' And whereas the existing and customary procedure with regard to the traces of the fire, murder, &c., according to law requires, first of all, that the existence of the crime should be shown by a *procès-verbal*, and an autopsy drawn up by official functionaries, and, secondly, that the proofs should be clearly stated, this notwithstanding he says also that at the time of the fire he had recourse to the local authorities. Had such a crime really been committed, in any case it is evident that the Assistant Public Prosecutor at Moush and the Judge of Instruction or other officials of judicial police would have gone to the spot, and would have hastened to draw up a *procès-verbal* and make an autopsy, and especially as Migherditch's father had previously maintained that this arson was committed at the instigation of Moussa Bey and his relation Suleiman Bey by another person, but had not been able to prove that according to the Assistant Public Prosecutor's official despatch No. 22, dated the 30th August, 1305, and whereas his brother and servant, Ohannes, whilst asleep at the time of the burning of the straw store, had all their clothes burnt, but were themselves not burnt at all, nor had they on any part of their limbs wounds or scars, which is unimaginable and unnatural, and if there be any wound or scar, the fact that there was no sort of doctor's report to prove their existence is in opposition to law and science; and although it is stated that Moussa Bey committed this arson because, on being dismissed from his post of Mudir, he asked the villagers for a testimonial to his good conduct, which they refused to give, hostility would not be necessitated by Moussa Bey's asking the villagers for a testimonial (and not getting it), and if there was such hostility it would necessarily follow that he would have done

this to the Moukhtars and priests of the villagers who did not give the testimonial, and therefore this statement is false."

At this point, *the President* asking him whether his speech would be much longer, he replied:—

"Naturally, because, as it is necessary to set forth now the contradictions brought about by the erroneous and conflicting statements in the evidence of the witnesses, I shall, with your permission, set forth the conflicting evidence which, while completing these statements of Migherditch, I consider forms a starting-point for the refutation of of this witness' evidence."

Public Prosecutor.—He may say this afterwards.

Mehemet Ali Effendi.—What has to be said about the contradictions between the evidence of the witnesses and their depositions should be said at this point of the trial. I am bound to defend these rights of mine to the last extremity, and have a demand to make respecting them.

The Public Prosecutor stating that witnesses concerning another case cannot be heard, Mehemet Ali Effendi said, "The witnesses will give evidence about another case. I am about to discuss the contradictions of the witnesses with regard to this case. It is not necessary to put off my demands on the ground that time is passing, and as it will be a reason for the annulment in Cassation of the sentence to be given, I should like decision to be given that I should not be heard."

The Public Prosecutor demanded from the Court a decision for the rejection or acceptance of his demands. Decision was given for the hearing of them after the hearing of the witnesses.

On this point the President questioned Moussa Bey, who said:—

"My Lord, whatever these people say is false, because, from their statements, it appears a store was burnt, while in our country there are none. What they call a straw store is a stone building half as high as a man, which is filled with straw. If the straw inside this had burnt there would have been no flame, but it would have become as black as soot. Besides this, Agop, who was 70 or 75, and deaf, had, according to his own statement, the seventh rick in the line where the burnt rick of Ohannes was, and as the interval between each rick is twenty or thirty paces, the space between each is a question of five minutes' walk, which makes a distance of thirty-five or forty minutes. How was it that Agop, who is so old, came so far at once, and how could he distinguish me and observe that I had matches in my hands; for what they call naphtha lights are common matches? If I were to go as far as St. Sophia I wonder if he could see me? Besides, at that time Tahir Pasha, Ali Pasha, and Saleh Pasha, and myself, with 150 people, had gone to Samosa (? Sassun) to collect revenue, which is a distance of exactly forty hours from their village. On the night when the fire took place I was collecting revenue. How could I have come and gone so far?"

Izzet Effendi.—My Lord, this point is certainly a most important one. Consider that it is impossible for a man to pass over such a distance of 80 hours so easily.

Public Prosecutor.—These are, as a matter of fact, things proper to the defence. Mehemet Ali and Izzet Effendi wanted to say a few words, but have been very long about it, whereas your honourable Court is occupied. In my humble opinion the witnesses must be heard first, and then for the defence to be made. Must all of it be heard? There is no meaning in discussing the case piecemeal.

After deliberation on the point of his being heard, or not, which deliberation he asked for, his speech was postponed till the defence, by the President's orders.

The witness Ohannes was brought into Court.

President.—What is your name and father's name?—*A.* Ohannes, son of Ohannes.

Q. Where do you come from?—*A.* From Moush.

Q. How old are you?—*A.* 46.

Q. Where do you live now; what is your business?—*A.* I am working in a mill at Soutari.

Q. How long is it since you came from your country?—*A.* About nine months.

President (pointing to the plaintiff Carabet).—Do you know this man? Is there any relationship between you?—*A.* Yes, I know him. There is no relationship, but I know him as a villager.

(*Witness sworn.*)—One night I left my room and walked about the village.

President.—Why were you walking about?—*A.* As a watchman.

Q. Did you always walk about?—*A.* We sometimes walk about, and that was the case that night.

Q. What o'clock was it?—*A.* 4 or 4:30. We met several people.

Q. Who were they?—*A.* Moussa Bey and his companions.

Q. Did they say anything to you?—They saw me. "Don't come here or I'll burn you," said they.

Q. Afterwards what did they do?—*A.* They entered the house and took the goods away.

Q. From where did you see them take the goods away?—*A.* From the place where I was.

Q. Did you wait until they left the house?—*A.* Yes.

Q. How much property did they take away, and of what kind was it?—About six loads; clothes, linen, &c.

Q. Could it have been six loads of linen? How could you see that it was linen; were you near them?—*A.* They were not horse loads, but men's loads. I am not certain it was linen. I was near them.

Q. How did they break through the roof? Who went in?—*A.* They pierced it with the staves in their hands. I don't know who went in. They were two persons.

Izzet Bey.—Let him describe them well and exactly.

President.—Were you the watchman of the village? Were you alone?—*A.* It is usual for us to walk about. We watch by turn. I was alone.

Q. What space did you go over?—*A.* I went over four streets.

Izzet Bey.—Did they pierce another hole there? How long did he and how long did Moussa Bey stay there?—*A.* Yes, while there they pierced the hole. For forty minutes or perhaps an hour.

Public Prosecutor.—How large was the hole?—*A.* About an arshin and a-half.

President.—Could a man pass through it?—*A.* Yes, he could.

Izzet.—What was the thickness of the wall?—*A.* An arshin.

Public Prosecutor.—Was there a bed among the property stolen?—*A.* No.

Izzet.—How long did they take to pierce the wall?—*A.* When I went they were piercing the wall.

Izzet.—Here is a contradiction.

President.—Who went through the hole?—*A.* Two persons, Eumer and Mourad Beys.

Izzet.—Who came out first? Was there any light on the scene?—*A.* I don't know; it was dark.

President.—Who pierced the wall and with what did they pierce it?—*A.* Mourad Bey, with his staff.

Q. Where was Moussa Bey?—*A.* Near the window.

Q. What part of the wall were they piercing?—*A.* At a place an arshin high from the ground.

Izzet Effendi.—That evening did not he tell it to anybody? Where did he go?—*A.* I went home; I said nothing to anybody.

Q. Did not he say anything to anybody afterwards?—*A.* Other people said it.

Azmy Bey, Clerk of the Court, said there was a contradiction between Ohannes' present statement and his deposition at the Instruction Department, as he said there was a bracelet, necklace, and bed among the property brought to the Instruction Department.

On Ohannes being questioned on this point, he said he declared he had heard this from another person.

Public Prosecutor.—There is a great contradiction between these statements of Ohannes. He may afterwards explain it by saying he did not know Turkish.

Another witness, Boghos, was brought in. As he did not know Turkish, Manouk, one of the spectators, was taken as interpreter.

President (to the interpreter).—What is your name, place of origin, and your occupation?—*A.* Manouk, 27, from Bitlis, domestic servant.

Public Prosecutor.—It would be better that the interpreter appointed should be a person having an official position. The Clerk, Bagdik Effendi, acted as interpreter in the Instruction. If you approve, let him be sent for.

Simon Effendi Tinghir.—Among the members of the Court there is one who knows Armenian; Moussa Bey, too, knows Armenian.

The Court decided that there was no harm in the interpreters not having an official position, as owing to the presence of those who knew that language among the audience, on both sides, and especially in the Court itself, it would be impossible to distort the question and answer.

President (to witness through the interpreter).—What is your name, father's name, age, place of origin, village, and occupation?—*A.* Boghos, son of Vartan, 25, from Moush, village of Ardank, labourer at a mill in Scutari.

On being questioned to that effect, he identified the parties, stated that there was no relationship of any sort and no other connection. Sworn twice on account of the Public Prosecutor making an objection to the witness' manner of pronouncing the word "Vallahy" ("So help me God"). At this stage Moussa Bey came to the edge of the dock and stood behind Simon Effendi

Witness.—We were watching the village. We walked about, and outside met two or three persons and went near them. "Silence, or we will burn you," said they.

President.—Who were they?—*A.* Moussa, Eumer Bey, Ahmed Bey, Tchallow Mourad Bey, Jezay Bey, and others.

Q. What were they doing?—*A.* Half of them were piercing the wall, and half were standing on the roof watching. Afterwards they went inside, and took away the goods.

Q. Where were you?—*A.* In a hollow.

Public Prosecutor.—He says "we;" who was his companion?—*A.* Ohan.

Q. What Ohan? If it is the previous witness, let him point him out.

Witness did so.

Izzet Effendi.—Let him be precise. What o'clock was it?—*A.* 4 or half-past 4. I have no watch.

President.—What was the weather?—*A.* It was moonlight.

Simon Effendi.—The interpreter is translating wrongly. He says the moon was down.

Public Prosecutor.—The procedure of the Court is being violated. Everybody intervenes. If a capable interpreter had been brought this would not have happened. How high was the moon?—*A.* The height of two men.

Izzet.—Can he state what was the month?—*A.* It was in this month.

President.—What was the year?—*A.* Two years and a-half ago.

Public Prosecutor.—In whose room was he?—*A.* In Carabet's.

Q. Did they see anything when they went out?—*A.* We went out on account of the barking of the dogs.

Izzet. Did Ohan go out with him?

Ohan was asked.—*A.* He went one way and I another.

Public Prosecutor.—How many people were sitting in the room?—*A.* We were four persons.

Q. Was Carabet there too?—*A.* He was not.

Q. Why were they sitting there?—*A.* It was warm there.

Q. Were none of the owners there?—*A.* No.

Izzet. My Lord, he said, "after Moussa Bey went away we gave the alarm." Let a question be put on that point.

Question put.—*A.* Yes, after they went we gave the alarm.

President.—How?—*A.* After they went we shouted, and people came out.

Recess of the Court for a quarter of an hour. On the return of the Judges the Public Prosecutor said he must ask Boghos again for various explanations about Moussa Bey, and asked that he should be again placed in the witness-box. The witness was accordingly brought. As it became necessary to appoint an interpreter, on Izzet Bey's proposal the Honourable Gaspard Effendi, lawyer, who was then among the spectators, was appointed and sworn. While translating the questions to Boghos, the witness did not understand the Constantinople dialect of Armenian, which he spoke. Another interpreter was taken from among the spectators, viz., Carmick, a printer, aged 27, who was duly sworn.

Public Prosecutor.—This man says he was there when Moussa Bey was piercing the wall. There were four persons in the room, and the room was very near. When it was possible for them to have gone back at once and alarmed the others, did he do so, I wonder? Would it not have been more prudent to have done so?—*A.* After they went away we came to the room.

Q. Up to that time where were they?—*A.* We were in the hollow looking on.

Q. What is the distance between Mighorditch's room and the place where the hole was found? Was it far?—*A.* It was about 50 paces off.

Q. While the hole was being opened, and until the goods were taken away, were they all there? Why did not they give the alarm to anybody?—*A.* We were in the hollow. We waited until they went, and then we gave the alarm and came back to the room.

Q. He says the distance between the hole and Mighorditch's room was only

50 paces. If Moussa Bey said to him there, "I'll burn you," why did they wait in the hollow instead of going back to the room?

As the witness would not give an answer owing to his not understanding the interpreter's dialect, the Court was again obliged to have recourse to another interpreter taken from the audience. Ohannes Effendi, of Moosh, age 22, employed by Karaghos Effendi in his office, was the fourth interpreter chosen, was sworn, and was ordered by the President to translate this question again.

A. (through the Interpreter).—On leaving the hollow we gave the alarm to Migherditch's house, viz., the house that was robbed.

Q. What is the distance between the hole that was opened and the hollow?—*A.* About 50 arshins.

President.—What is the distance between the hollow and Carabet's room?—*A.* The place which was pierced and the place where we gave the alarm are close together.

Public Prosecutor.—Why did they not go to Migherditch's room, as it was nearer?—*A.* We could not go, as we were afraid.

Q. What was the wall, where the hole was, made of?—*A.* Of earth and stone.

On Izzet Bey's demand for the intervention of the Public Prosecutor in consequence of the discrepancies in the evidence of the witness Boghos, whom he maintained to be a false witness, the Public Prosecutor declined to take any action until all the witnesses had been examined.

Case of Extortion.

Hadji Kevork was put in the witness-box. After the case was described to him in detail, he was sworn.

President.—What is your name?—*A.* Hadji Kevork.

Q. What is your father's name?—*A.* Avedis.

Q. What is your age and place of origin?—*A.* 40; I am from Ardank.

Q. What is your occupation?—*A.* I work in a mill at Scutari.

Q. How long is it since you came to Stamboul?—*A.* About ten months.

Q. Now, say truly what you know and saw.—*A.* What I know and saw is that Moussa Bey took 20 liras from Carabet.

Q. Did you see it?—*A.* Yes; I saw it with my own eyes.

Q. Where did he take this money?—*A.* In Carabet's room.

Q. Who came there?—*A.* Moussa Bey, Mourad Bey, and others.

Q. How was it that you were there?—*A.* I was sent for.

Public Prosecutor.—Who sent for you, and what were you told?—*A.* Carabet sent for me. "Come, try and find a remedy," said he.

Q. What remedy; what did they do?—*A.* Moussa Bey asked for money, which they paid.

Q. How much was it, and why did they pay it?—*A.* They paid 20 liras; Moussa Bey had tied Carabet.

President.—Where did they get this money from?—*A.* 10 liras from the village of Vartenis. Carabet's wife and mother went and got them; the remainder they gave themselves.

Q. Had Carabet no more money?—*A.* No.

Q. Why did Moussa Bey ask for this money? Was it due to him?—*A.* No; he took it by force.

Q. What did he do?—*A.* In our country we have thick cord with which men are tied. Moussa Bey said to Carabet and his father, "If you don't give me 20 liras, I'll tie you up," and he tied them. When he received the 20 liras he untied them.

Public Prosecutor.—He says Moussa Bey had bound Carabet. To what place did he tie and where did he tie him?—*A.* He tied him to a pillar from the knee to the middle with rope.

Q. Did he only tie Carabet, or were there others?—*A.* They also tied his father Ohannes.

Q. Whom did they tie first?—*A.* Carabet, because his father was old.

Izzet.—Who gave Moussa Bey the money?—*A.* Carabet counted and gave it with his own hand.

Q. How could a man who was tied get this money?—*A.* His hands and arms were free.

President.—Did Moussa Bey beat him?—*A.* Why should he? He was going to get the money. (Laughter.)

Public Prosecutor.—How many minutes afterwards did Moussa Bey tie up Carabet's father, and how long were they tied up?—*A.* Although he begged him not to do so, it was no use, he tied him up, and they remained so for two or three hours.

Q. Witness says Moussa Bey took 20 liras. The money was got here and there. In villages there are no changers, and everybody has not got gold. Were they all Turkish liras, or was there English as well? Was there any change?—*A.* They were all Turkish. I gave one of them.

Q. Who tied them up? Was it Moussa Bey or his companions?—*A.* Moussa Bey gave the order, the others tied them. On getting the money they untied them and went away.

On Izzet Effendi saying that Moussa Bey had a statement to make, the President inquired what it was.

Moussa Bey, taking a Koran from his pocket and showing it, said, "This is the Koran, please give me the Gospel before the witness."

President.—What are you going to do?

Moussa Bey.—Please give it to me, my Lord. They have said so much, I am going to say something.

Izzet Effendi.—Let it be given, he is not going to do anything improper.

By the President's order one of the ushers gave Moussa Bey the Gospel.

Moussa Bey.—We recognize Jesus as a prophet. Each of these books we consider holy. I swear by both that what they have said is a pack of lies. They are Armenians and are protected. (Sensation.) I see Dragomans of Embassies present. (Sensation.)

Public Prosecutor (interrupting him).—This is unnecessary and irrelevant.

The Gospel was put back in its place.

Moussa Bey (continuing).—I never acted in this way. In our village there is a Council of Elders and a priest who are all against us. I am a man of family and the Chief of a tribe.

Public Prosecutor (again interrupting).—No answer has been given to my question. Who was untied first?—*A.* The father, and then Carabet.

Q. He says some of the liras were obtained from the village of Vartenis. How far is it?—*A.* Five minutes' distance. A quarter of the village, as it were.

Q. Some of the villagers went to Ohannes' house to entreat Moussa Bey. Who were they? He said this in the interrogatory.

President (to the Clerk of the Court).—Read this witness' deposition.

Azmy read it. The Public Prosecutor was right.

Witness.—I was not there. Moussa Bey began to tie Carabet. Afterwards the children told his father, Ohannes, of it, and he came to entreat Moussa Bey, but fruitlessly, and was afterwards bound himself.

Public Prosecutor.—When he went to Carabet's room, who was there?—*A.* I saw Carabet tied. I had with me a man named Khalo, and I found several persons in the room.

Q. Did Moussa Bey and his companions come on foot?—*A.* They never go on foot, they were all on horseback.

Q. How many horses were there?—*A.* I did not count them. The men whom I saw were ten. Of these, I knew six, viz., Moussa, Tezay, Umer, Husso, Hassan, and Challo Mourad Beys, and the rest I did not know.

Q. Did they come in the room?—*A.* Yes. The room is large; about half the size of this Court.

Q. Where were the horses? Where could so many horses stop?—*A.* They were in a meadow which is large, and can hold 200 horses. Ohannes is a man of some importance in our country.

Izzet.—The village where he says they went to get the money is named Vartenis, and is a full hour from Ohannes' village. Ask the Moushirs.

This Hadji Kevork gave his evidence straightforwardly like a man, and in cross-examination was unshakable. He was by far the best of all the witnesses examined.

Minas, son of Malcolm, of Ardank, was the next witness. He did not know his age, was sworn after he had stated he had no relationship or other connection with either of the parties, and after the oath to translate correctly had been again administered to the interpreter Ohannes. The evidence of this witness, who was the village watchman, was exactly similar to that of Hadji Kevork, with the exception that Minas maintained that the money paid to Moussa Bey, amounting to 20 liras, was composed of liras and medjidiehs. He further stated that the distance from

Ohannes' village to Vartenis, whence the money was brought, was from two minutes to half-an-hour (the difference between running at full speed and sauntering slowly).

The Public Prosecutor asked why Moussa Bey wanted the money. Was there any partnership between them?—*A.* No.

Q. This witness in the Instruction Department said Moussa Bey and his companions were fifteen. Is this statement, or his present one, correct?—*A.* Moussa Bey and those with him were altogether ten or fifteen persons.

On the conclusion of the examination of this witness, *the President* said to the Public Prosecutor: "Shall we go into the other case?"

Public Prosecutor.—The papers might be read, and the two cases united, and if we have time we might hear the witnesses. If not, the case might be postponed till to-morrow.

Koumash Cadin was summoned for to-day.

She was brought into Court and seated.

Koumash, widow of the miller Malkhass, *v.* Moussa Bey:—

President (addressing Moussa Bey).—You are accused of wounding and killing Malkhass. Listen to the document which will be read.

The Mazbata (Report) of the Chamber of Accusation, and the act of accusation (or indictment) were then read by the Clerk of the Court, Azmy Bey. I annex a translation of these two documents.

President (to Moussa Bey).—From the documents which have been read it appears that you killed the miller Malkhass as he came out of his mill.

Public Prosecutor.—Moussa Bey is accused of wilfully murdering Malkhass. I will give some explanation. On the 19th February, 1302, one of Malkhass' relations informs the Government in writing that Malkhass was struck by lightning and died, and there was no rumour to the effect that he died of a gun-shot wound. Two persons, viz., Malkhass' cousin (or uncle), the priest Kapriel, and his nephew, were summoned. They said they saw nothing on the body to attract their attention, and allowed its burial. The son was summoned, and he said his father was wounded in the foot by a bullet which came from an unknown direction, and afterwards died naturally at the end of January, two-and-a-half years ago. Afterwards, when His Imperial Majesty gives orders for Moussa Bey's trial, Koumash comes to Constantinople and presents a Petition. She states that, while her husband Malkhass was coming from the mill, he was wounded in the thigh, but she did not know whether it was the right or left one. Although Moussa Bey was said to be the person who shot her husband, he afterwards had him buried by two priests whom he had menacingly ordered not to mention the affair, which was to be considered an accident. Two other witnesses also make this statement. He is also said to have promised to marry the son. According to the two priests' statements, Malkhass has been wilfully murdered. I demand the hearing of the witnesses.

On the witnesses Gaspard and Temedre being called for by the ushers, Simon Effendi Tinghir rose and declared that the witnesses, being priests, received orders from the Patriarchate not to attend, although they had signed the summonses. A "teskéreh" was written to the Patriarchate demanding them, and the priests, who had come, went away, saying that they could not attend. The Public Prosecutor, this notwithstanding, demanded that the priests should be fined, as the law made no exception in their favour, and according to the law there was no "Amir Mugbir" (one who has the power of enforcing his orders by putting to death or otherwise) in Turkey.

(N.B.—This last assertion was also made at the trials of Midhat, Nouri, and Mahmoud Jelaleddin Pashas for the supposed murder of Sultan Abdul Aziz.)

Simon Effendi rejoined that the priests could not help themselves, as they were under their Patriarch's orders, and he referred briefly to the question of the administration of the oath to priests in Courts of Law, now pending between the Ministry of Justice and the various Patriarchates.

(*Note.*—It should here be stated that whenever priests have had to be sworn, the practice has hitherto invariably been to send them to their respective Patriarchates, where the oath has been administered to them by their hierarchical superiors with much solemnity. This practice is claimed by the Patriarchates as one of their privileges arising from the invalidity, according to the canons of the Oriental Churches, I believe, of an oath administered by a layman to a clergyman, who at his ordination

takes an oath to always speak the truth. As a matter of fact, I have never heard of a case of perjury committed by a priest when the oath has been administered under such conditions.)

At this point the Court rose, after rejecting a demand for Moussa Bey's release on bail, and ordering him to be detained at the Ministry of Police instead of allowing him to return to Scutari. The time was 10·45, Turkish time, about 3·30 in the afternoon.

The case was adjourned until Thursday morning.

[*To be continued.*]

Constantinople, December 4, 1889. (Signed) J. ALVAREZ

No. 101.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received December 13.)

(No. 486.)

My Lord, *Constantinople, December 6, 1889.*

WITH reference to the subject of the acquittal of Moussa Bey, I have thought it advisable to obtain from Mr. Stavrides, who, as your Lordship is aware, possesses a wide experience of the manner in which judicial cases are conducted in this country, a legal opinion as to the course pursued by the Bench and the Public Prosecutor in this trial.

A copy of a Memorandum by that gentleman is herewith inclosed. In this document Mr. Stavrides severely criticizes the position taken up by the Public Prosecutor, who indeed, in some instances, rather adopted the rôle of counsel for the defence.

The "Juge d'Instruction" appears from this statement to have also acted beyond his rights, and Mr. Stavrides considers that the President of the Court was hardly equal to the position he was called upon to occupy; but, at the same time, Mr. Stavrides is of opinion that the verdict was in some measure due to the unskilful management of the plaintiffs and their counsel.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 101.

Memorandum by Mr. Stavrides.

I HAVE before me only a part of the long and carefully prepared Memorandum of my colleague, Mr. Alvarez. I am therefore obliged to have recourse to the records of the local press, both Turkish and European, which, although not very accurate and published under the control of the judicial authorities, are sufficient to enable me to submit an appreciation of the proceedings of some of the officials from a legal point of view. And to begin with the Procureur Général, that official is, as you are aware, according to law the natural prosecutor in every criminal case, consequently, when he received the denunciation of several crimes attributed to Moussa, it was his bounden duty to make the most minute researches and investigations in order to secure evidence sufficient to bring home to the accused the alleged crimes. Moreover, having been informed that the accused had many accomplices in the perpetration of the alleged crimes, he was likewise bound to institute proceedings against them, and to see them arrested and put under trial simultaneously with their principal. He, on the contrary, remained quiet during the interval of the interrogatories, and left the care of producing evidence to the plaintiffs. Subsequently, when the case went before the Court, he, contrary to the law, usurped the authority of the President in conducting the debates himself, in putting either irrelevant or captious questions to the witnesses in order to perplex them and make them fall into contradictions, and in constituting himself the advocate and the defender of the accused; lastly, when the witnesses fell into contradictions, not on the main facts, but on some minor circum-

stances, he pointed them out to the Court triumphantly in his concluding speech, and went to the extent of demanding the punishment of the witnesses for perjury. I beg to declare, therefore, that his conduct from beginning to end was wilfully illegal and systematically hostile to the plaintiffs.

As to the "Juge d'Instruction," his conduct was of a piece with that of the "Procureur-Général." He was informed by the first-coming witnesses that the accused had many accomplices; he was therefore bound to see them transferred to Constantinople, interrogated and confronted both with the plaintiffs and Moussa Bey. He ought to know that the investigation of the case could not be completed without the information which he could derive from the interrogation of the accomplices. He, instead of doing that, overstepped the legal limits of his power, by indulging in an appreciation of the evidence which was produced. His irregular conduct was disapproved even by the "Chambre des Mises en Accusation," which distinctly declared that the "Juge d'Instruction" had no right to enter into an appreciation of the produced evidence.

Coming now to the verdict of the Court, I do not think myself justified in criticizing its finding, which is not a question of law, but a question of conscience. Their finding may be right or wrong when acting as a jury, namely, when they say that the prisoner is guilty or not guilty, but the law has nothing to do with it. I beg only to observe that the President proved himself not up to the mark by letting the Procureur-Général usurp his authority and conduct the debates in his stead.

In conclusion, I find that the acquittal of the accused Moussa was a foregone conclusion for the judicial authorities, as it appears even by the preliminary investigation conducted by Ibrahim Effendi, the member of the Court of Cassation (see Memorandum of that official published in the "Djeridei-Mehakkein"). I must not omit, however, to state that the manner in which the case was conducted on the part of the plaintiffs was neither skilful nor well conceived.

(Signed) C. G. STAVRIDES.

No. 102.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received December 13.)

(No. 493. Secret and Confidential.)

Constantinople, December 7, 1889.

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith to your Lordship a copy of a secret Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez, giving his appreciations of the manner in which the trial of Moussa Bey was conducted. He, like Mr. Stavrides, is of opinion that the position of the Public Prosecutor was most irregular; and he further criticizes the action, or rather callousness, of Simon Effendi, the Counsel for the plaintiff, who, according to Mr. Alvarez, would appear to have received his instructions from the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Alvarez concludes by explaining the manner in which the Judges were divided in giving their verdict, the majority not, however, being sufficient to condemn.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 102.

Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez.

(Secret and Confidential.)

I HAVE to give, for the information of his Excellency the Ambassador, the following account of the manner in which the trial of Moussa Bey was conducted from the 23rd November to the 2nd December, 1889.

I have marked it Secret and Confidential, on account of its containing many statements which it might not be advisable to publish, and, in the event of his Excellency deciding on the publication of the more salient points, I should like to be consulted as to the consequent alteration of the Memorandum.

What struck myself as well as M. Gargiulo almost immediately after the entry of the Judges into Court was the remarkable tone adopted by the Public Prosecutor,

Khaled Bey, towards the plaintiffs in the case, and the manner in which he practically took upon himself the direction of the proceedings.

Although in my Memorandum No. 370 the President is described as putting most, if not all, of the questions addressed to the parties and witnesses at the first hearing, yet, as a matter of fact, the President only put purely formal questions as to name, age, &c., and a few leading questions, the Public Prosecutor conducting the public interrogatory almost exclusively, and very frequently the cross-examination. I have been informed by M. Gargiulo that the Turkish papers were only allowed to publish an account of the proceedings after their copy had been revised by the Ministry of Justice, and, therefore, I am not astonished at the numerous inaccuracies in their description, some of which only could be altered in my Memoranda.

This usurpation of part of the functions of the Court excited general astonishment and great discontent among the Judges, some of whom expressed their opinion to M. Gargiulo and myself on this point during the recess.

Later on I saw in the "Tarik," at the close of one of its reports, a statement to the effect that the Public Prosecutor acted in this way on account of the President being tired. This was not the case, but this insertion was made in consequence of the Public Prosecutor becoming aware of the comments that were made on all sides as to his conduct on this occasion. Throughout the case the Public Prosecutor behaved as if he had been the lawyer for the defendant, not only to the great dissatisfaction of many of those present, but also to that of the defendant's lawyers, who were thereby considerably thrown in the background. And this was especially the case at the first hearing.

At the second, it appeared very much as if the Public Prosecutor had received a hint to display less zeal, for his language was much more moderate, although until the conclusion of the trial he did not alter his plan of action in the slightest. This was evidently to discredit the witnesses as much as possible, and thereby secure Moussa Bey's acquittal.

I regret to have to express the opinion that Simon Tinghor Effendi, who appeared for the plaintiffs, and who is a lawyer of long standing and of some reputation here, defended his clients very weakly. I say "defended his clients" advisedly, because for all the assistance they got from the Public Prosecutor they might be said to have been the defendants and Moussa Bey the plaintiff. As for their interests, they were simply neglected. Simon Effendi's speeches were on no occasion up to the ordinary average; he made no attempt to check the Public Prosecutor, or to protest against his action as being contrary to all precedent, as he would have been perfectly justified in doing, nor did he vindicate the witnesses for the prosecution with any energy from the aspersions that were cast upon them by the Public Prosecutor and the lawyers for the defence. I have been reliably informed that after the first hearing he was sent for by the Minister of Justice, who, after various compliments, told him that in this case he was expected to behave as "loyally" towards the Imperial Government as he and the rest of the family had done hitherto. It is unnecessary for me to explain this language, which was probably accompanied by more tangible considerations. I am convinced that Jevdet Pasha is to a great extent responsible for this scandalous miscarriage of justice, notwithstanding the assurances I have confidentially received from Schahbaz Effendi, that no pressure of any sort was put upon the Court.

With reference to Hussein Tewfik Pasha, Ahmed Pasha, and Ahmed Bey, the officers who came from the Palace, I may say that, as regards the first, I did not remark any attempt on his part to influence the President and members of the Court, or any conversation, in whispers or otherwise, which could excite any suspicions during the five hearings of the case. I fear I cannot say the same for Ahmed Pasha, as, on the two occasions when he attended, I noticed there was a considerable amount of private conversation with the President, to which the members of the Court were not admitted. Beyond one or two expressions which might be taken simply as a private opinion, I am not aware of any attempt made by Ahmed Bey to influence any member of the Court.

In consequence of what is stated in the first part of my Memorandum No. 371, I have no reason to suppose that any pressure from the Palace was put upon the Court. I am bound to state, however, on information from a source which is perfectly reliable, that the President of the Court was summoned to the Minister of Justice on the conclusion of the second or third sitting, and after a conference of over half-an-hour, on his return it was remarked with some surprise that his views as to the culpability of Moussa Bey, at all events on certain points, had undergone considerable modification. I have hitherto considered his Excellency Vassef Effendi as a man of sterling

integrity, if anything inclined to over severity, and should be sorry to have to change my opinion. Other members of the Court have been importuned and influenced by various officials of the Ministry of Justice, and under all the circumstances of the case I am not surprised at the Judgment given by the Court. The Judgment has been given in such a manner as to show as much appreciation for the facts brought out by the evidence as was compatible with the necessary acquittal of Moussa Bey on all the four charges brought against him. Speaking judicially, and excluding the Mousb and Bitlis interrogatories absolutely as having taken place in a district where the accused's local influence was notorious, and the Constantinople one partially, on account of Ibrahim Bey's inquiry having no judicial character, and taking into chief consideration the evidence given in Court and the results of cross-examination, I should say that the evidence in the first case is such as not to exclude doubt, of which of course the accused would get the benefit, that in the second case the verdict should have been "Not proven," while Moussa was undoubtedly guilty of extortion, and it is difficult to conceive his acquittal on this point by any Judges whatsoever. The evidence in this case was so strong that Moussa Bey could find nothing better to do or say than the making of the direct appeal to Mussulman fanaticism contained in Memorandum No. 376. In the murder case Moussa Bey was certainly guilty, the contradictions in the evidence being slight, and not of such a nature as to justify a doubt.

(Signed) JUSTIN ALVAREZ.

P.S.—The majority in the Court against Moussa Bey which was not sufficient to condemn him was composed of Emin Effendi, Nicolaki Effendi Kharalambides, and Artin Effendi Mosditchian. The President and Salyk Bey were the minority. I am informed that Tewfik Pasha, after the Judgment was given, expressed great satisfaction with the result obtained. Should an appeal in "Cassation" be made it would most probably be accepted, and a new trial would be ordered before a Court differently constituted.

J. A.

No. 103.

Memorandum by Sir J. Fergusson.

I RECEIVED this intelligent and prepossessing gentleman (M. Minasse Tchéraz) to-day by your direction. He said that he should have been glad to have had an opportunity of seeing your Lordship as he had been the accredited Armenian Delegate at the Congress of Berlin. I said that you had directed me to receive him as you are too much engaged, and as Armenian questions are especially noticed in the House of Commons.

He said that what he would state he would equally desire to be known to the Turkish Ambassador. The Armenians could wish for nothing better than that Rustem Pasha should be Governor at Erzeroum. In Lebanon he had established his character as a firm and impartial administrator. He knew that Rustem Pasha had urged on the Grand Vizier the importance for the credit of Turkey that Moussa Bey should be punished.

Though not now an accredited Representative, he knew that he could speak for the Armenian nation generally. He was in no sense an agitator, although if he were at Constantinople to suggest any reform, or need of reform, he would be regarded with suspicion.

It was a great mistake to suppose that the Armenians desired their country to be independent (they were too feeble), or that it should be taken by Russia. They would regard it as a misfortune. Russia crushes out nationality and alien religion. Even the Armenian church at Kars had been given over to the Orthodox worship. If the Turkish Government was too weak, the Russian was too strong. The Armenians within the Russian frontier hated their rule, and he had been warned by some of his fellow Armenians there against it. Yet the Russians employ Armenians in the army and make many of them Generals, while the Turks will not trust them. But the Armenians are more patriotic than the Turks themselves. His hope for the future would rather be if the Turks had to leave Europe, for then they would probably have to make their Empire in Asia a Turco-Armenian State. It was very unwise of the Turks not to utilize the real attachment of the Armenians.

He had travelled lately along the Russo-Austrian frontier and had seen the preparations for war. The Gallician Poles spoke enthusiastically of the preservation of their nationality by Austria in contrast to Russia and Germany, and said that, if war should come, all Poles would be on the side of Austria. Yet the Slav sentiment would naturally gravitate towards Russia, while between the Armenians and the Russians there was no kinship of race or religion.

He knew how distasteful were foreign schemes of autonomy or even of reform to the Porte. Some reforms had been suggested by Her Majesty's Government; these were of a very moderate character, such as Mixed Tribunals and a mixed gendarmerie; but what he thought might be entertained by the Porte without the distaste of foreign interference was the proposal made by the Porte for the reform of Armenia during the Dulcigno blockade, of which the chief feature was the formation of Armenian communes. Such a proposal voluntarily carried out would involve no disgrace or loss of prestige.

He was of no political party, and his people would be wrong to lean upon any foreign political party. He believed that the Conservatives wished them as well as the Liberals, and tried to assist them by *managing* the Turks. It was the blind and bigoted people who surround the Sultan, who represent every suggestion for Armenian reform as insidious, and carry to the Russian Embassy the news of every British counsel. The Russians do not wish for reform in Turkey which would defeat their purposes.

He dwelt on and repeated his disclaimer of any hostility to the Porte; he only wished that it would attach his people more to the Empire, and that reform should come from it. But his people were constantly intimidated so that they hardly dared to complain, while too often the officials, who had paid heavily for their appointments, could not help recouping themselves as they best might.

In conclusion, he would always be glad to speak frankly on these subjects, and as frankly to the Turkish Ambassador as to your Lordship.

He mentioned that he had been Head of the Armenian College at Constantinople,

a well-paid appointment, which he had given up in the hope of better serving his people.

J. F.

Foreign Office, December 17, 1889.

No. 104.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received December 25.)

(No. 482.)

Constantinople, December 5, 1889.

My Lord,

WITH reference to my despatch No. 480 of the 4th instant, I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of a Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez, giving a Report of the third sitting of the trial of Moussa Bey.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 104.

Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez.

THE third sitting in the trial of Moussa Bey was held on Thursday, the 28th November, at the Criminal Court of Appeal. The Court was constituted as on Tuesday. The Palace Dignitaries, who had previously been present, again made their appearance with the exception of Ahmet Pasha. M. Garguilo arrived before myself, and after a short interval the Judges proceeded to take their seats on the Bench at about 7·30, Turkish time a little after 12. There was no abatement in the interest displayed by the spectators, who completely filled the Court-room. Moussa Bey was, as before, in the dock with two policemen behind him; and the plaintiffs, with the lawyers on both sides, were in their proper places. The weather being very warm, the Court windows had to be opened; and as the acoustic properties of the Hall are none of the best, hearing became very difficult.

The President (addressing the Public Prosecutor).—The two priests, whose evidence is necessary concerning the wounding and killing of Malkhass, the miller, by Moussa Bey, are now here. Have yo anything to say before we examine them?

Public Prosecutor.—No; let the witnesses be heard.

Izzet Bey.—My Lord, is it not necessary for the record of last sitting to be read?

President.—No; on the last occasion we only had it read for Salih Bey's information, as he replaced Tahsin Effendi.

On the President's order, the priest, Gaspard Effendi, was brought into Court.

Q. What is your name, age, place of origin, and profession?—After objecting that he did not know Turkish, *Gaspard* replied: "41 or 42; from the village of Ardank, near Moosh; priest."

On the President administering the oath to him, Gaspard Effendi declined to take it, on the ground that, when he was ordained priest, he took an oath to tell the truth, and, as a priest, he could not swear without the leave of the Patriarchate. He asked for an interpreter. The Court proposed to take his evidence unsworn.

Public Prosecutor.—My Lord, he took the oath in the Instruction Department.

Gaspar Effendi.—Yes, I did so.

President.—If so, then you must take it here.

Gaspard Effendi.—I will tell truly what I know.

Izzet Bey.—My Lord, he must take the oath; if he does not, let him refuse to give evidence. This is a criminal matter.

Public Prosecutor.—The law provides a penalty for those who refuse to give evidence on oath. I demand a decision conformable to Article 284 of the Penal Code.

President (to the priest).—You hear what the Public Prosecutor says? He demands that you be fined.—*A.* Allow me, my Lord, to say that, for us to take an oath is a sin; but whatever are His Imperial Majesty's orders, I will comply. I will say what I saw.

Emin Effendi.—It is the law that orders it.

President.—Yes; the law is the Sultan's order.

(Witness sworn. For taking the oath he was hissed by some of the audience.)

Witness.—It was 11 o'clock in the evening. I wanted 5 piastres. I saw Moussa Bey.

Q. Where were you?—*A.* To get those 5 piastres I went to the "harman" of Father Temetre. I saw Moussa come with a gun. "Whom is he going to shoot," I said to myself. I looked about me, and saw three persons coming from the direction of the mill.

Q. Where was Moussa Bey?—*A.* Moussa Bey passed us, and entered the hollow in front of the "harman." Then he fired. I looked, and saw one of the three men fall to the ground.

Q. What did you do when you saw this?—*A.* Nothing. I said, "Is he an Armenian or a Mussulman?" Moussa Bey got up and went away. When he passed and saw me, he said, "Silence." I was afraid, and said nothing. The villagers afterwards went to him, saw him, and brought him to the village.

Q. How many went?—*A.* A great many.

Q. Was the wounded man dead?—*A.* No.

Q. Did he say anything?—*A.* No; he could not speak.

Q. When did he die?—*A.* An hour afterwards.

Q. Was that man Malkhass, the miller?—*A.* Yes.

Q. Was he buried, and when?—*A.* Yes; the next day.

Q. Who buried him?—*A.* All of us.

Q. Did the Government hear of his death, and when?—*A.* Yes; two or three days afterwards.

Q. Ha! Was nothing said to Moussa Bey? Were not the villagers asked?—*A.* I don't know.

Q. How many villagers carried the dead man?—*A.* I don't know.

Q. Were none of them known to you?—*A.* I don't know.

Q. Didn't you go to see the wounded man?—*A.* I didn't go; I don't know.

Q. Where did they take him to?—*A.* To his own house.

Q. He was wounded, wasn't he?—*A.* Yes; he had a bullet wound.

Q. Where?—*A.* In the leg.

Q. Which leg?—(Pointing to the right thigh.) *A.* I don't know whether you call it the right or the left (in Turkish).

Q. The right. Was the wound large?—*A.* I don't know.

Q. You know he was wounded, and that the wound was in the leg. How is it that you don't know the wound?—*A.* I don't know. I didn't go and look at it when I went to the house at the funeral. The son was crying, and I was also grieved.

Public Prosecutor.—When was he buried?—*A.* In the morning.

Q. What was the date?—*A.* Two and a-half years or two years and eight months ago.

Q. What was the season?—*A.* Snow-time.

Q. That is to say, winter?—*A.* There was snow.

Public Prosecutor.—At the Instruction Department, in his deposition he said there was no snow.

By the President's order, the deposition was read by Azmy Bey.

The Public Prosecutor's statement confirmed.

Witness.—In my deposition I said there was snow in the fields.

Public Prosecutor.—Was the sky cloudy?—*A.* I don't remember. I said it took place two and a-half years, or more, ago. How can I keep in my memory so many details after such a lapse of time?

Mehmet Ali Effendi.—He left something half-said about Moussa Bey. How was the body buried?

President (to the priest).—Continue. Moussa Bey sent for you and told you to bury the body, didn't he? Why wasn't the Government informed?—*A.* We said, "Let us inform the Government." "There is no need," said he. Two or three days after the Government sent for the murdered man's son, but I don't know what took place. After this affair Moussa Bey married the murdered man's son to a girl of his own village.

Q. In what village did the wedding take place?—*A.* In our village.

Q. Who married them?—*A.* I did, with another priest.

Public Prosecutor.—What was the girl's name?—*A.* I cannot remember it; I can only say what I know.

President.—You ought to have known it.

Public Prosecutor.—He says it was "harman time" (thrashing season), and after-

wards that it was winter?—*A.* In winter and summer the place used to thrash the wheat and barley is called "harman."

Q. What was the priest, your companion, doing at the "harman"?—*A.* I went to his house. They told me he went to the "harman," so I went there.

Q. Did you get 5 piastres?—*A.* Not then.

President.—Afterwards?—*A.* After this affair, I don't know whether I got them; I don't remember.

Public Prosecutor.—Malkhass and his companion were coming from the direction of the mill. What was the distance between the spot where Moussa Bey was and where Malkhass was wounded?—*A.* I don't know; I have no watch.

President.—Don't state in hours.—*A.* About four to ten minutes.

Public Prosecutor.—How many paces?—*A.* I don't know how many.

President.—Could you see a man?—*A.* Yes.

Public Prosecutor.—Although at first he did not recognize the three persons who came, does he know, or did he afterwards hear, who they were?—*A.* Of the three, one fell down and was carried away by the villagers. I did not think of asking who the others were.

Q. He was at the "harman," and Moussa Bey came there, but did Moussa Bey come before or after them?—*A.* After.

Q. Moussa Bey went into the hollow. On what side was it?—*A.* There was a hollow below the barn (straw store).

Izzet Effendi.—What was the depth of the hollow, and what was the height of the ground where he was above the hollow?—*A.* The depth of the hollow was about an arshin.

Q. How far was the hollow from the two priests?—Witness gave a description in the Court showing it was about 20 paces.

Public Prosecutor.—Gaspard Effendi says the hollow was behind the straw store, and afterwards, from his own description, it appears that he was in front of the barn.—*A.* We were at the "harman." We did not go inside the barn. The hollow can be seen from there.

Izzet Effendi.—Let him describe the place.

President.—At what part of the barn were you?—*A.* At the door. We were standing opposite the other barn.

Public Prosecutor.—There are now two barns. What was their position? From the witness' description, it appears one was opposite the other.

Izzet Effendi.—He says there were two barns. In front of which were they standing?—*A.* In answer to the President's question, I don't know whose the other barn was. I was standing before the priest's barn.

President.—What was his name?—*A.* Temedre.

Q. The man from whom you wanted 5 piastres?—*A.* Yes.

Public Prosecutor (at Izzet Bey's suggestion).—Let him describe the door.—*A.* We were standing before it. I don't remember it.

Izzet Effendi.—Let this be taken down. Because it will be seen that there is considerable contradiction between this witness' statement and the others.

Public Prosecutor.—What was the distance between the place where Malkhass was wounded and the village?—*A.* Four or five minutes.

Izzet Effendi.—Are there any priests in the village besides himself?—*A.* Yes.

President.—How many? What are their names?—*A.* Four. I am one. Temedre is another; and the others are Kapriel and Matheos, who is old.

Q. Are they there?—*A.* Two of them are. Temedre and I are here.

Izzet Effendi.—When Malkhass was buried who were the priests at the funeral?—*A.* All four of us.

Izzet Effendi.—Just now he said he did not go.

Public Prosecutor.—He didn't say, "I didn't go;" he said, "I didn't get any money for it."

Mehemet Ali Effendi.—My Lord, let him explain what part of the body the "kalcha" (thigh) is.—*A.* It was this part (pointing to the right thigh).

Izzet Effendi.—Who paid his expenses, &c., to come and give evidence at Constantinople?—*A.* Malkhass' widow, Kumasch.

Izzet Effendi.—My Lord, this money should have been paid by the Local Government. How is it that Kumasch pays it? We have difficulty in getting witnesses to come even from a short distance. Who told the villagers that Malkhass had been wounded that they should have gone and carried him to his house?—*A.* We didn't.

President.—Who did?—*A.* They must have seen him and brought him in.

Izzet Effendi.—When Moussa Bey came, was he on horseback or on foot, with companions or alone?—*A.* On foot, alone.

[Disturbance among the audience caused by the absence of standing room. The President threatened to clear the Court if order was not maintained.]

Public Prosecutor.—When was the body buried?—*A.* We buried it in the morning.

Q. Was it very early?—*A.* The sun had risen.

President.—Did you go of your own accord to Moussa Bey?—*A.* No; he sent for me.

Public Prosecutor.—He said he had been sent for by Moussa Bey in order that this affair should not get to the hearing of the authorities. Did he send for him alone, or were other people sent for?—*A.* He sent for me alone.

Q. Was no other person present? Was no other person sent for as he was?—*A.* No. That evening he sent for me. Afterwards the others also came. He had sent for them as well.

Q. Why?—*A.* To tell them, "Don't mention this to the Government. It will be bad for you."

Q. Who were those who came?—*A.* Many persons.

Q. Does'nt he know the names of any of them?—*A.* I don't remember their names.

Q. Who invited them?—*A.* Moussa Bey sent for them.

Q. What did he say to them?—Bury this dead man.

President.—What reply did you make?—*A.* We can't bury him; we must let the Government know.

Q. What afterwards?—*A.* We were afraid, and buried him.

Q Why were you afraid?—*A.* He said, "I'll do for you."

Public Prosecutor.—Where did Moussa Bey send for these people?—*A.* To Malkhass' own house.

Q. Did'nt he send for them to another place?

Izzet Effendi.—Where did they take Malkhass directly from the place where he was?—*A.* To his house.

Q. Where was he put? Did he say anything?—*A.* He could not speak. We put him in his house.

Q. How many rooms in the house were there? Where was the wounded man put? Where were you?

President.—Was he placed in a room or in the court-yard?—*A.* There is only one room in the house.

Public Prosecutor.—Where was he placed?—*A.* On a piece of felt.

Gaspard Effendi then left the witness-box.

President (addressing Moussa Bey).—You have heard the priest describe how the murder took place. What do you say?—*A.* My Lord, I didn't go there for my pleasure; I was a Government official. Why should I, a Mussulman, kill the man, a miller, against whom I had no grudge. I neither saw him, nor did I kill him. The Witness says I went into the hollow, that I took aim, and shot Malkhass. Our country is not like this place. There the snow reaches the height of a man. The very least is 3 spans, and more. The time of which they speak is two or three months later. How could I go into the hollow so and take aim?

Q. Where were you that day?—*A.* I was in the village. They say, "Moussa Bey killed Malkhass." It is natural for a man, even here, when he marries his daughter, to ask the Mukhtar or other persons. The girl's father asked me, "Shall I marry my daughter to Malkhass' son, who has asked for her hand?" and I said, "You are an Armenian, and so is he. Why not?" There are 100 men in the village. How is it possible for one man to wound and kill another, and then sleep alone in that village? But all these people have a spite and enmity against me. They see me here; they say they wish to see me in prison. The Government prison is better than my house. Whatever they say, I know nothing about it. There is a priest, Malkhass' brother on the mother's side. If he were to get into my clutches I would treat him worse. I would take out his eyes. (Sensation.)

Public Prosecutor.—He admits he was there that day. Was he a Mudir?—*A.* No.

Q. Even if he had no official situation, as he was a man of family in those parts, didn't he hear that a man had been shot?—*A.* No; they didn't tell me. I know nothing about the funeral.

Q. Just now he said he knew something about the affair?—*A.* It was not about this.

Q. In that case, how does he know about it? Usseb said, "My father, though wounded by a bullet which came from an unknown direction, did not die on that account, but of hemorrhoids fourteen days afterwards. Moussa Bey came and looked at him."

President.—I have seen that record also. There are several Petitions of Usseb's.

Public Prosecutor.—In order to clear up the matter, let them be read. The fact that Moussa Bey was there on the day of the event is proved by Usseb's deposition. Let Moussa Bey state positively if he was there or not, and why he was there.

Moussa Bey.—The village is near. I used always to go and come, shooting. But I have no knowledge at all of the commission of such a crime. Three months afterwards in the village they said, "Moussa Bey did this."

Public Prosecutor.—When did Moussa Bey marry Usseb; because he admits he married him?—*A.* Three years ago. In the third month, after the commencement of the snow.

President (to Public Prosecutor).—That will be in January or February.

Moussa Bey.—I have a statement to make.

Q. Say on.—*A.* Justice is equal for all. These three or four persons are plaintiffs, and I am a prisoner; they are free. They have drawn up a Mazbata against me, and those at Musch are also against me. All the priests, Boghos, &c., are my personal enemies. Bring their Mazbatas, and see if their signatures are not there. Are they plaintiffs or not? Now half of them are witnesses, half are plaintiffs. I cannot accept their evidence, but I will submit to the opinion of the Court, and am ready to sacrifice my life for the empire.

Public Prosecutor.—Now, let the other witness be heard.

The priest, Temedre Effendi, was put in the witness-box. He began to speak in Armenian, and asked for an interpreter, as he could not speak Turkish.

Public Prosecutor.—How was it that he gave his deposition directly at the Instruction Department without an interpreter?

Artin Effendi Mosditchian, one of the Judges, interpreted this to him, and also his reply that he had made use of signs.

[At this point there was a great disturbance among the audience, and a loud cry from the body of the Court.]

President.—If this interruption continues, and if silence cannot be restored, I will clear the Court at once.

The Clerk of the Court was referred to in order to find out whether an interpreter was appointed in the Instruction Department, or if, as he said, he gave evidence by signs. It was stated that he had replied directly in person without an interpreter.

President.—What is your name, father's name, age, profession, and place of origin?—*A.* Temedre, son of Auton, 30 or 35, priest, of Ardank. When he was about to be sworn, he, like the other priest, Gaspar, said, "I cannot take the oath" (to the policeman who pushed his arm towards the Gospel, "Leave me alone"); I am a priest. When I was ordained I took an oath to tell the truth; this must be enough. In the Gospel it is said it is a sin to swear. I will take care to tell the truth.

Public Prosecutor.—Didn't you take the oath in the Instruction Department?—*A.* Yes.

Q. If it is a sin to take an oath, why did you do so then?—*A.* I took it, but the Patriarch reprimanded me for doing so.

Q. The other priest took the oath. Gaspar Effendi brought forward admitted he had done so.

President (to witness).—You must take the oath.—*A.* I cannot do so without the Patriarch's orders.

Public Prosecutor.—I demand the imposition of a fine according to Article 284 of the Penal Code?—*A.* If it is the order of His Imperial Majesty the Sultan I will comply.

Judge Emin Effendi.—It is the law that orders it.

President.—Yes; the law is His Majesty's order.

Witness then took the oath amidst the hisses of some of the audience.

President.—Tell us what you know about this case?—*A.* I saw Moussa Bey shoot and kill Malkhass.

Q. Where were you? Were you alone? What was the season?—*A.* It was winter; I was at the "harman." As I was going to take straw out of the barn the priest, Gaspar Effendi, called after me. I stopped, said I was busy, and he came up. We were talking. Just then Moussa Bey passed us and entered the hollow. "Whom is he going to shoot?" said we.

Q. How did you know he was going to shoot somebody?—*A.* There was no game. He fired his gun in the direction of the mill. From that direction three persons were seen coming. One of them fell and rolled on the ground. We said, "Look; is it a Mussulman or an Armenian?"

Q. Did Moussa Bey say anything to you?—*A.* He said, "Silence!" We held our tongues. Afterwards Malkhass was brought in wounded, and died an hour after.

Q. How did you know it was Malkhass?—*A.* He wore "aba" (coarse cloth), from which I knew him.

Q. Where was he shot?—*A.* In the right thigh. Next day Moussa Bey sent for us.

Q. Where?—*A.* In Malkhass' house. He said, "Bury the dead man, and don't you inform the authorities, or I'll treat you in the same way." From fear we said nothing, and buried the body. Moussa Bey then got on his horse and went away. He afterwards sent for Usseb, the son of the murdered Malkhass, and told him he would be like a father to him and take care of him, if he would make no complaint to the authorities. He promised not to complain. Moussa afterwards married Usseb. There was a wedding. Afterwards the authorities sent for Moussa Bey and Usseb. They both went to Moosh, but I don't know what happened.

Public Prosecutor.—Was there much snow?—*A.* There was, but not much in the hollow, which was trodden.

Q. What thickness was it?—*A.* I don't know; I didn't measure it.

Q. Who came from that village?—*A.* How do I know? The villagers. I did not go.

Q. How many houses are there in the village?—*A.* Forty.

Q. Where did Moussa stop?—*A.* At the house of Mardiros.

Q. Where did he sleep; in a bed?—*A.* On the floor. There are no beds in our country.

Q. Did you see Malkhass' wound?—*A.* Yes; the bullet passed through the upper part of the thigh.

Q. Did Gaspar Effendi see it?—*A.* I don't know. Gaspar was in Malkhass' house, but I don't know if he came before or after me.

Q. Was it in the right or left thigh?—(Witness pointing to it.) *A.* It was on this. Do you call it the right?

Q. Yes. Did you go to Mardiros' house or Malkhass' house alone, or with Gaspar Effendi?—*A.* I don't know. I have forgotten. I was there with him.

The Public Prosecutor called the attention of the Court to certain contradictions, among other things, saying, "He was twice interrogated, and then persisted in saying he went with Gaspar Effendi."

Izzet Bey.—When and how did the villagers know that Malkhass was wounded, that they went and brought him in?—*A.* They were on their roofs.

Q.—How in the middle of winter they were on their roofs?—*A.* Our roofs are not like those here. They are made of earth. We sweep the snow off them. "Dam" (roof) with us means house.

Izzet Effendi called the attention of the Court to certain contradictions.

After describing the place where he and Gaspar Effendi were, he said they were 200 paces off the spot where Malkhass was wounded.

Public Prosecutor.—What was the distance between the hollow where Moussa Bey was and the spot where Malkhass was wounded?—*A.* From 150 to 200 paces.

Q. How could you recognize Malkhass at this distance?—*A.* There was a mist. If there had been none I should have recognized him. I could only distinguish his clothes.

Moussa Bey.—Is it possible to take aim in a mist?

Public Prosecutor.—What time was it?—*A.* 11 o'clock (Turkish time) in the evening.

Q. When did Moussa Bey arrive on the spot? Before or after Gaspar?—*A.* After Gaspar. He passed near us.

Q. Did you then give Gaspar the 5 piastres he asked for?—*A.* Not then; I gave it to him afterwards when we went home.

President.—What negligence! There is a man shot, and you go quietly home! In your eyes, he wasn't worth even a bird?—*A.* The man was shot. Had we anything in our hands? What could we do?

Public Prosecutor.—Whose daughter was the girl whom Moussa Bey married to Ussch, the son of Malkhass?—*A.* I don't know. Let him say.

Q. Were you not present at the marriage?—*A.* Yes; we were in church.

President.—Don't you know the girl's name?—*A.* No; I did not ask.

Public Prosecutor.—When Moussa Bey came near you, did he make any sign of salutation?—*A.* No.

Q. How far from you was he when he passed you?—*A.* Five paces.

Q. Five paces is very near. If a man passes so near, he certainly makes some sign or says something?—*A.* No, Sir; he said nothing.

Recess of the Court from 8·40 to 9·30, Turkish time (from 1·40 to 2·30).

On the return of the Judges, the *Public Prosecutor* asked the witness whether the barn-door looked on the mill or not?

Witness.—The road goes to the mill, which can be seen if you stand in the doorway.

Q. Were they standing in the doorway?—*A.* When Moussa Bey turned into the hollow, we saw him. There is a wall 2 feet high near the door. We could see the hollow from the "harman." We went four or five paces off him. Moussa Bey took aim and fired. We said, "Is it a Mussulman or an Armenian?" "Silence!" said he.

The Public Prosecutor asserted there were contradictions between their present and their previous statements to the Court.

President.—Why did you go after Moussa Bey? Had you any suspicion?—*A.* No; we wondered what he was going to do, as there was no game there.

Public Prosecutor.—How many times were you sent for to Mardiros' house?—*A.* Twice; once when going to the funeral, and once when coming back with Ussch and some villagers.

Q. Was Gaspar Effendi with you?—*A.* I don't know; there was a crowd.

Q. Did he go on the first occasion?—*A.* I don't remember. There was a crowd.

Q. Were you specially sent for by Moussa Bey?—*A.* A servant from the village came and said, "Moussa wants you."

Q. What was his name?—*A.* I don't know.

Public Prosecutor.—There is nothing more to ask.

Moussa Bey then said.—When this man came here he said he did not know Turkish, and afterwards he gave evidence in that language. He said he would not take the oath, and then he placed his hand on the Gospel and wished to cheat the prophet Jesus. What he has said is a lie. Is the evidence of such a man acceptable not only here, but in England? Let the Mazbatas they presented against me at Bitlis be brought, and, if his seal is not there, I'll accept his evidence. The deceased died four years ago naturally. This they don't say. If a man's father dies in this manner, does he celebrate a wedding with drums on one side and clarionets on the other? I never shot Malkhass, and was not molested by the authorities.

President (to witness).—Are you related to Malkhass?—*A.* No.

Public Prosecutor.—Was the priest Kapriel?—*A.* Yes, his cousin. That day he cried over the corpse.

Moussa Bey.—He is his brother on the mother's side.

The priest, Temedre, then left the witness-box.

President (to Public Prosecutor).—There are several depositions of Ussch's.

Public Prosecutor.—Let them be read.

The denunciation of the crime by the priest Gabriel and Ussch, son of Malkhass, dated the 19th February, 1302, and addressed to the Assistant Public Prosecutor at Moush, is as follows:—

My cousin, the miller Halkhass, of the village of Ardank, aged 60, was a fortnight ago wounded at night in the right leg, &c.

President (to Azmy Bey, Clerk of the Court).—Read Ussch's Petition addressed to the same official, and dated the 17th March, 1304: "My father, Malkhass, died naturally last year, but it was said he had been murdered by Moussa, and on information given to the authorities by his enemies I was summoned and examined. My father did not die from a wound, and Moussa Bey had no hand in or knowledge of his death, and I declare that I have no claim whatsoever. A year has now elapsed, and the inhabitants of several of our villages in our neighbourhood who are hostile to Moussa Bey accuse him of having murdered my father in order to revenge themselves. I request that no attention be paid to what these persons say against Moussa Bey.

At Ussch's first interrogatory, he stated that his father died from hemorrhoids at the age of 60, after a fortnight's illness. When he came to Moush he presented a Petition, as some Armenians told him "Moussa Bey killed your father; prosecute

him;" but, notwithstanding the instigations of Musso and Agop, as there was no trace of a wound on his father, he could not do so, as he feared God, and he repeated that those who made the accusation were not afraid of God. "Why should I slander Moussa Bey; neither I nor my mother will do so."

At the second deposition he said he did not know whether his father died naturally or was murdered, but there were traces of a bullet on the right leg, and he heard from his father's own mouth that he was wounded on the road while coming from the mill, but could not say who wounded him, nor did he (the son) ask, but Moussa Bey saw this crime, and the son sent a man to him to search for the criminal. He did not see Suleiman Bey and the Kurds of Marinick. He had no suspicion against anybody.

President.—Ussch says, "I saw a wound, and Moussa Bey saw it, too." He says he sent a man to you to search for the criminal.

Moussa Bey.—I know nothing about it. I saw nobody.

Simon Tinghir Effendi then got up, and proposed that the Court should question the widow Koumash. She stood beside Simon Effendi, taking the place of Carabet, who passed behind. Ohannis Effendi, who had acted as interpreter at the previous sitting, was again employed.

Koumash said she did not know her age, but it was about 30; that she was from Ardank, and the widow of Malkhass.

President.—Tell us what you know.—*A.* My husband left the house in the morning safe and sound, and was brought back wounded.

Q. Who brought him back?—*A.* They were Armenians who brought him on their backs, but I did not notice who they were; I was too much pained.

Public Prosecutor.—Who wounded him?—*A.* I don't know; he was dying, and could not speak.

Q. When did he die?—*A.* In the evening.

President.—Who had him buried?—*A.* Moussa Bey did.

Q. Didn't you tell the women, your neighbours, that your husband was dying?

Izzet Effendi at this point rose and said vehemently, "I notice the plaintiff Carabet and the priests whispering to this woman. I protest against this."

Koumash was brought forward before the President and the Public Prosecutor.

President.—So you didn't tell anybody of it. Why?—*A.* I was afraid.

Q. Why? Did Moussa Bey say anything to you?—*A.* He said, "If you say anything about it to anybody, I'll kill you and your son, too."

Q. Were you alone in the house the night Malkhass died?—*A.* I was with my son.

Q. Even though it was night, didn't you tell the neighbours when he died?—*A.* What could they do? I have come here. Who helps me.

Q. When did the funeral take place?—*A.* In the morning.

Q. Who buried him?—*A.* Moussa Bey and the priests.

Q. Where was Moussa Bey?—*A.* In the village.

Q. You didn't tell him. How did Moussa Bey know of it?—*A.* He killed him himself; that was how he knew of it.

Q. How?—*A.* He stood over him.

Q. Where did the crime take place?—*A.* On the road.

Q. When?—*A.* When he was coming home from the mill.

Q. At night?—*A.* At about 12 o'clock in the evening.

Q. Moussa Bey does not know about it. Where was he that night?—*A.* In the village.

Q. Are you sure?—*A.* He stopped at Mardiros' house.

Public Prosecutor.—Did Moussa Bey come to Malkhass' house that night?—*A.* He was at the door. I saw him with my own eyes.

Q. In the Instruction Department she said she did not see him there, but at Moush.—*A.* I was not in my senses. I have been ill.

Q. Did Moussa Bey send nobody else besides the priests to bury the dead man?—*A.* He only sent the priests.

President.—At what o'clock did Malkhass leave the house?—I don't know the hour. In the morning he went to take flour to the mill. They brought him back at 11 o'clock in the evening.

Public Prosecutor.—Let her explain another statement she made at the Instruction Department. At Museh, Moussa Bey promised to marry her son and look after her.—*A.* I didn't go to Moush; my son did.

Q. Did you make no deposition anywhere?—*A.* No; I don't know what I said; I was ill.

Q. Had Moussa Bey any grudge against your husband?—*A.* None at all.

Koumash, who was very pale and looked unwell, then retired.

Carabet, the other plaintiff, was then questioned by the Court. He said:—"Moussa Bey bound my father and myself, took our 20 liras, and released us. He burnt our hayrick and store, pierced the wall of the house, and stole our property. We paid exactly 20 Turkish liras. He says he was Mudir then." To Moussa Bey: "When were you Mudir?"

On account of the lateness of the hour (10·10, Turkish time, about 3·10 P.M.), the Court adjourned till Saturday.

[To be continued.]

(Signed) J. ALVAREZ.

Constantinople, December 5, 1889.

No. 105.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received December* 25.)

(No. 483.)

Constantinople, December 6, 1889.

My Lord,

WITH reference to my preceding despatch No. 482 of yesterday's date, I have the honour to transmit a copy of a Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez, giving a full Report of the conclusion of the trial of Moussa Bey.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 105.

Memorandum by Mr. Alvarez.

THE Criminal Court of Appeal held its fourth sitting in the trial of Moussa Bey on Saturday, the 30th November, 1889. As on the previous occasions, a large crowd had assembled before the Court doors were thrown open, and the Court-room soon filled. I was informed that the local press, both Turkish and foreign, was as before largely represented. Moussa Bey was brought into Court at about 7·30, Turkish time (a little after 12), and the prosecutors, Carabet and Koumash, came in immediately afterwards. All the witnesses who had hitherto appeared were also present. The Court entered at 7·40, Turkish time, and was constituted as before. Tewfik Pasha and Ahmet Bey were again present, as well as M. Garguilo and myself. The President called upon the Public Prosecutor to make his speech, as the witnesses had been heard, and the prosecutor had spoken. The following is a rendering of the greater part of his speech:—

"My Lord, Public Prosecutors are, as you are aware, charged with the defence of the law, and the rights of the public and justice is the outcome of the assurance of the right course of law. It is probable that those who are not acquainted with the niceties of law, and those who are incapable of appreciating the important duties intrusted by law to the Public Prosecutor, consider that his duty consists in speaking against the suspected and accused person who is brought before the Court in all cases. Public Prosecutors' duties are not so limited; they are not to be compared to private prosecutors. For example, a prosecutor can bring an action whenever he considers himself injured, and, right or wrong, he carries on that action. If he is right and is successful in obtaining his rights he rejoices, and if he is wrong and the result does not fall in with the object of his interest he feels aggrieved. But no one else can have these feelings of joy and grief. Public Prosecutors' action is exactly the opposite and converse of this. The result obtained affects the public on whose behalf they appear. They have, on the denunciation or complaint of actions which are forbidden by law, either to bring an action in chief, or to see that the inquiries, investigations, and formalities are carried on and executed within the pale of law, or to pay attention to the proofs, to examine the correctness or incorrectness of the action, as well as the truth or falseness of proofs, to put forward a demand before the Judges, and to conform their opinions to the results of the examination of the case. As they are charged with the search of crimes, they will bring an action against those who commit a crime in the course of their inquiry, should they perceive it. They are under no obligation, conscientious or legal, to throw an uncertain light on the suit they have begun. Their duties are defined by law. But it is evident that there is nothing to limit their line of action in bringing out the truth. Public Prosecutors prosecute those who are accused of what is called crime in common with the private prosecutor. But if they see the falseness of the case, they make their demand accordingly. Public Prosecutors cannot be right in every action they bring, as, being charged with the search for crimes, they are consequently bound to prosecute whenever they are informed of an act constituting a crime. As the suit is not a personal one, they cannot, at first, be aware of its importance. They are enlightened by the investigation, and they, in their turn, enlighten the Judges with their opinions. It is impossible that they should be bound to throw light upon every action they take up from the point at which they commenced, and then to endeavour to conceal its falsity when they know it to be false, as in that case the protection of public interests is impossible. The right of a suspected or of an accused person is included in the interest of the public. So much so, that the law allows Public Prosecutors to petition for the annulment of the Judgment on accused who will be condemned, but does not allow them to demand the annulment of a sentence of acquittal when the accused has shown his innocence. If a prisoner has committed the crime of which he is accused, he receives a fitting penalty, and others are deterred and the public profits thereby. But supposing an innocent man is accused, if the proofs on which his indictment is based are not thoroughly examined and he is condemned unjustly, its effect on the public interest is greater. On this account the defence of the rights of suspected and accused persons is most necessary for Public Prosecutors, and consequently it cannot be maintained that the Public Prosecutor should limit his action to one point as the private prosecutor does. In short, the Public Prosecutor's duty is very important, and it is extremely necessary that he should endeavour to seek out the truth. Consequently, we have paid particular attention to the inquiries necessary for the explanation of the contradictions among the witnesses' depositions in the Instruction Department, in order to perform at this trial the sacred duty of serving justice. While doing so, many other contradictions have been come across which I intend to submit to your attention one by one, and this imposes upon me the duty of demanding that the Court should act accordingly to Article 281 of the Law on Criminal Procedure.

"I shall first point out one after another the contradictions in the evidence given in the Instruction Department and before your honourable Court by Boghos Bedian and Agop, son of Parma, witnesses in the case of arson. In the Instruction Department, while Boghos said he saw the fire take place in Migherditch's 'harman' at 5 o'clock in the evening of Thursday, July 24, three years ago; that he went and saw only Moussa Bey with a light in his hand firing Migherditch's haystacks; that he shouted out, 'Moussa Bey is firing Migherditch's store, hay, and rick;' and that the villagers came while Moussa Bey fired in the air several times and ran away. Agop says one night three years ago, about 3·30 or 4 o'clock, he saw smoke, looked, and saw Moussa and Umer Beys with lights in their hands setting fire to Migherditch's father's hay. He called out 'Fire,' &c. Thus, both witnesses describe the time and circumstances of the fire in a contradictory manner. Boghos said he alone saw this fire, and Agop said he saw it with his own eyes. Boghos said Moussa, Umer, and Zezay Beys were on horseback, and the others were on foot. Agop said that Challo Mourad was on horseback, but said nothing about Zezay Bey's being on horseback. In their evidence before your honourable Court, Boghos said that Moussa, Umer, and Zezay Beys and Mourad were on horseback, that Moussa's horse was white and the others red (bay or chestnut), while Agop said that Moussa's and Challo Mourad Beys' horses were red. Boghos hereupon said, in opposition to his deposition in the Instruction Department, that he had said that Mourad was on horseback, and Agop said that Umer Bey's horse, which in the Instruction Department he had said was white, was red, and Mourad's, which he then called bay, was red. Thus, both made conflicting statements. Boghos said that the light in Moussa Bey's hand was a large torch smeared with naphtha, while Agop said Moussa and Umer Beys had common lighted matches in their hands. Boghos said that the clothes of Ohannes' son Kenias and his servant Ohannes, who were taken out of the burning store, were completely burnt. Agop said that their clothes were not burnt. Boghos said that at first he did not see Agop when he went to the fire, while Agop said he saw Boghos and Boghos saw him, and they talked and shouted together.

"Both in the Instruction Department and before your honourable Court, Agop said Boghos went to the place of the fire before him. Boghos says that when he went he shouted out, 'Moussa Bey is firing Migherditch's store, hay, and harman.' Agop before the Court says that he and Boghos only shouted out 'Fire.' These statements are conflicting and contradictory to their depositions in the Instruction. While Boghos said that after the villagers came Moussa Bey fired into the air four or five times and went, Agop says there were two shots, and they were fired from afar. While Agop said both in the Instruction and in Court there were seventy or eighty ricks in the village, all of which were in a row, Boghos said there were seven or eight ricks in a row—(the Public Prosecutor here entered into lengthy details about the number, position, owners, &c., of the ricks). While, according to Agop's statement, the arson took place in July, and Kenias and the servant Ohannes should have been sleeping on the ricks, they went into the store and fastened the door from the inside; from local information, it is proved that the fire took place on the night of the 16th July, 1303, that is to say, two years ago, whereas they say three years. Migherditch says that for three years past he has been at Stamboul, and has not been to his country, yet he says he was then at Bitlis. While Ohannes admits that on his previous application to the authorities at Moosh he maintained but could not prove his claim, that on Moussa Bey's instigation, or that of his relative, Suleiman Bey, his barn was set on fire; Agop declared, four or five days after the fire, and Boghos that night, that they saw Moussa Bey set the fire, and told Ohannes so. These are irreconcilable statements.

[*Note.*—I fear the Public Prosecutor occasionally distorts the evidence, and he certainly takes no account of Agop's deafness.]

"Coming to the evidence of Boghos, son of Vartan, and Ohannes, son of Moukhtar, about the burglary, Ohannes said, in the Instruction Department, that two and a-half years ago, one night in autumn, about 4:30, Moussa Bey and his companions broke through the wall of Migherditch's house, went inside, and took away a bed, linen, and other property, and that those who broke through the wall were Moussa, Umer, and Challo Mourad Beys. Afterwards, in contradiction to this statement, he said that Moussa Bey was standing at the window; and whereas he first said that this took place in the autumn, he afterwards said that he did not know whether it was before or after autumn; also that the wall was broken through with staves (bars) in ten minutes or a quarter of an hour; afterwards that the wall was of stone, and an arshin thick, and that he was at a distance of 200 paces from Migherditch's house; that first he met many people, who said to him, 'Be off, or we'll burn you,' upon which he returned to his house; that Umer first passed through the hole, and then Mourad, and that when they came out with the property they came in the same order. These statements require examination, as it is impossible for a stone wall, an arshin thick, to be broken through with staves (bars) in ten or fifteen minutes, or for a person to see who went in or who came out, &c., at a distance of 200 paces. Boghos, after saying that Umer Bey was piercing the roof, and some of his companions went inside, said that they made a hole at the corner of the roof about the height of a man, through which they brought the goods, and, on being asked how the goods were taken out through a hole as high as a man, he said it was not as high as a man, but as high as the neck.

[*Note.*—There is a certain similarity of sound between 'boy' (height) and 'boyn' or 'boyun' (neck). And as the hole was large, the goods could be removed.]

"Ohannes further said that all, except Moussa, carried off the goods, while Boghos said that all went away loaded; while Ohannes said that he alone saw the robbers; that on their saying, 'We burn you,' he went away to his house, and did not give the alarm to anybody. Boghos says that he left Migherditch's room with Ohannes, and saw the robbery, of which they told the women in Migherditch's house; and, in another deposition, he says he was in such a fright at Moussa Bey's telling him, 'Don't say anything, or I'll burn you,' that he withdrew into a corner. On inquiries being made in the Instruction Department to clear up these numerous discrepancies, it was stated that only the points of these staves were of iron; that, although the wall was made with stone, there was no mortar, but clay. But the other contradictions could not be cleared up, and a number of fresh contradictions have appeared before your honourable Court. Ohannes, notwithstanding his previous statement in the Instruction, has positively stated to the Court that there was no bed among the articles stolen, and, on being questioned about them, he said they were women's clothes, a bracelet, and other such things. When he was asked how he saw the bracelet, he first said he saw it in Moussa Bey's hand, and when asked how he could see a bracelet

at a distance of 200 paces, he said that was what he had heard in the morning from the people of the house; that he left his house, and while walking about alone, on approaching Migherditch's house he saw Moussa Bey on the roof, and, on his saying, 'Don't come here, or I'll beat you,' he retreated into a corner, and waited for about an hour. This is in contradiction to his deposition in the Interrogatory. In his first deposition he said that when he saw the burglars the hole was nearly open, whereas, in his subsequent one, he said that they were just beginning to open it. When asked how Umer Bey and Mourad together broke through the wall when Moussa Bey was standing off the window, he said that Moussa Bey was breaking in from above, while Umer Bey and Mourad were doing the same from below. On being asked whether the hole was opened in the wall or in the roof, and what was the height of the wall, he replied that the hole was opened in the wall of the room at a place an arshin high from the ground, and the height of the wall was the height of three men from the ground.

[There has probably been some confusion in the mind of the Judge of Instruction or of the witness. Is the word "adem" (man) or "adum" (pace or step) intended? Both may be written the same way.]

He was then asked how could Moussa Bey on the roof and Umer Bey at the place where the hole was open it together? but he asserted that Moussa Bey was over the window.

Finally, the contradictions in the Instruction Department were increased in Court, the other witness, Boghos, persisting that Ohannes was not with him that night, and that he did not go to Migherditch's room. Boghos, too, stated, in presence of Ohannes, that he left Migherditch's room with Ohannes, and upon Moussa Bey saying "I'll burn you," he entered the hollow about fifty paces distant, and looked on at what Moussa Bey and his accomplices were doing; Ohannes persisting in contradicting him. While Boghos said in the Instruction Department that the hole was opened in a corner of the roof, and that it was as high as a man's neck, in Court he said that the hole was opened in the wall, and it was as high as a man. Asked the reason of this discrepancy, he replied that this was what he said at the Instruction Department. On this point, too, he was in contradiction with Ohannes. While Ohannes said there were six loads taken away, Boghos said there were two. Ohannes said there was moonlight at the time of the burglary; Boghos said that, although it was moonlight, that night at the time of the burglary the moon had not risen.

Coming to the evidence of Hajji Kevork and Minass in the case of extortion and violence, in the Instruction Department Hajji Kevork said that, one evening in winter, about twenty-two months ago, at 11 o'clock, Moussa Bey, with four persons whose names he gave, and five others whom he did not know, stopped as a guest in Migherditch's room, tied Ohannes, Migherditch's father, and Carabet, Migherditch's elder brother, and took 20 liras off them by force. Until the money was got together he said they remained tied up for four or five hours. Minass says that, a year and a-half ago in winter, on the Saturday before Christmas (a fast day), Moussa Bey, with three persons whose names he gave, and fifteen other persons whom he did not know, came down upon Migherditch's house, bound Ohannes and Carabet to a pillar, and, on getting 20 liras into his hands, loosed their bonds after they had remained bound for two or three hours. There are discrepancies as regards the date of the event, the time Carabet and Ohannes remained tied, and as regards the number of Moussa Bey's companions.

Notwithstanding Minass said that none of the villagers went near them from fear, he said he looked after the horses outside, while in another deposition he says the villagers came near Moussa Bey to supplicate him, and that he himself went with them and saw him. These are contradictions. In Court, not only could these contradictions not be reconciled, but Hajji Kevork said that Moussa Bey came with ten horsemen, while Carabet said that Challo Mourad, Umer Bey, and several other persons came with him, in all five or six, another discrepancy, while Minass contradicted his evidence in the Instruction Department. Hajji Kevork stated that the money was paid in Turkish liras, twenty in all; Minass says there were liras and medjidiehs. While Hajji Kevork says he was present when Carabet and Ohannes were tied up, Minass says nobody else besides himself was then present, and Hajji Kevork came when the money was given, and that he saw Carabet and Ohannes while bound, but did not see them when they were being bound. These witnesses said that Carabet and Ohannes were fastened to different pillars. Carabet, in the Petition presented to your honourable Court as plaintiff, states that he and his father were tied to one pillar. Hajji Kevork says that Carabet was first untied and then his

father. Minass says the contrary. While Minass said in the Instruction Department that the crime took place by day at 11 o'clock, Turkish time, in the Court he said that it took place when it was time to go to bed, and Hajji Kevork, who had been first examined, subsequently confirmed the statement.

[*Note.*—The Public Prosecutor, in his eagerness to obtain the acquittal of his client, Moussa Bey, forgets that Carabet is not a witness but a plaintiff, and does not scruple, at all events as regards the evidence given in Court about the extortion and violence, the most damaging against Moussa, to misrepresent the statements of witnesses and create imaginary inconsistencies.]

Coming to the evidence of the priest Gaspard and Tometre Effendis concerning the murder of Malkhass, in the Instruction Department Gaspard said that about two and a-half years ago in the winter, about 10 o'clock in the evening, he went to Tometre's "harman" for 5 piastres; that Moussa Bey then went and sat down alone in a hollow 20 or 25 paces opposite them, and fired at one of three men (Malkhass), who was coming from the mill from a distance of four or five minutes, while Tometre said that at about 11 o'clock in the evening of a Sunday in February, two years and eight months ago, he was talking with Gaspard, who wanted 5 piastres from him, when Moussa Bey passed them and went into a hollow 5 [?] paces from them, &c. That Malkhass was wounded at a distance of 150 or 200 paces, and there was a mist. These are statements contradictory as to time, place, and distance. Gaspard says that Moussa Bey sent for him to Malkhass' house, and menacingly ordered him to bury the dead man without informing the authorities of the crime. Tometre says that Moussa Bey sent for him to Mardiros' house, where he was stopping, twice and gave him orders. Here is another discrepancy. The Public Prosecutor then proceeded to examine at great length and with much detail the alleged inconsistencies, discrepancies, and contradictions existing between the evidence of the priest before the Court. After generally abusing the witnesses, and especially the priests, he declared that if they were not treated as false witnesses according to Article 281 of the Law on Criminal Procedure, he should, as Public Prosecutor, demand the application of the law regarding such persons. His speech lasted nearly an hour. The Court then withdrew, and returned after a recess of about ten minutes.

President (to Public Prosecutor).—Have you anything more to say?

Public Prosecutor.—No. I have now only to demand that these witnesses should be punished as false witnesses.

The President then deliberated with the members in a low voice.

Public Prosecutor.—The law has given this right chiefly to your high office; I see no necessity for declaration.

Simon Tinghir Effendi, rising:—

"My Lord, for a witness to be called a false witness, the accused must be acquitted. To give a decision of this sort beforehand implies the confirmation of the accused's innocence without giving a decision for his acquittal. This, naturally, is illegal."

Public Prosecutor.—I am waiting for the issue of the decision I just now demanded.

President.—The Court will deliberate on that demand of yours afterwards. If you have anything to say on the main question, please say it.

The Public Prosecutor then rose and said:—

"The duty of acquitting Moussa Bey or not belongs to your honourable Court. I am obliged to conform my line of action to the decision that will now be given. If Moussa Bey is declared guilty, I shall then naturally demand a penalty according to law."

President (to Simon Tinghir Effendi).—Have you anything to say?

Simon Tinghir Effendi then addressed the Court:—

"After the flatteries of the Sovereign and of the Administration of Justice, which are unfortunately customary in this country, and reference to the trial, which he justly described as unprecedented, he said he would confine himself strictly to the points of private prosecutorship and the denunciation of these crimes, and would not have anything to do with the action of the Public Prosecutor. 'There is no use of thinking,' said he, 'that I should proceed to demand damages and an indemnity after the guilt of the accused has been proved.' As it is possible that Moussa Bey, who is to-day before you a prisoner, may be declared guilty, at the close of the trial a decision that he has proved his innocence may be given, and as, anyhow, this suit has ceased to be an ordinary criminal action, considering the shape it has been beaten into, the

results of that judgment of acquittal may be very serious for the private prosecutor and denouncer, and for the witnesses who have just now given evidence. And the responsibility under which they will fall may be extended in a manner different to what they expect. As everybody will admit, the words I have uttered on this point are not suppositions, but points of which I feel certain. I desire to make some statements in introduction to the claim of prosecutors' rights, and, in defence of the persons whose attorney I am, to establish their right to prosecute.

"It is impossible not to confess that two points have been come across which call for attention during the hearing of the case which has been examined. The first of these is the contradiction between the inquiries at Moosh, the preliminary inquiries, and the interrogatories which have taken place at Constantinople and the discrepancy in the evidence given before the Court. Undoubtedly, these points are to be cleared up in the following way: The Report of the preliminary inquiries at Constantinople is not to be considered a document such as the law defines, and in consequence of the Petitions which were presented to the Imperial Stirrup, containing complaints of the inquiries which took place at Moosh, His Imperial Majesty's Decree, that the case should be examined according to law and justice, was issued, and therefore it must be admitted that the local and preliminary examination cannot be taken as a basis for comparison. The first is hereby disposed of. In order that nobody and no class of persons outside the Court should be blamed, and in order not to fall into the danger of searching for a secret motive for the repetition of Moussa Bey's name so often in the four quarters of the globe, and for this case's being beaten into every shape and form, whatever anybody may say, if, my Lords, your honourable Court supposes that you are hearing a common criminal case, and that the prosecutors are pure in heart and the witnesses impartial, the second point, too, will be set aside. Proceeding on the path which has been cleared by the removal of these two points, the goal which is to be seen from a distance is a condemnation. But it may be said that before arriving there, there are several discrepancies to be met with. This impediment consists in the fact that the prosecutors are not to be considered intelligent and learned men and the witnesses wise and sharp individuals, but simple men who can only convey to others with difficulty what they mean, and as these discrepancies will be set aside with the force resulting from the union of other private circumstances, in addition, if your honourable Court will endeavour to follow in the limits which I have submitted to it, the importance that is given to this action will disappear. I am sure the Court will give proof of real justice; I have no doubt that whatever the Judgment that is about to be given, it will have a force amply sufficient to disprove lying publications, that is to say, it will have proper legal motives. That the results of Moussa Bey's surrendering to Ottoman justice will be seen is evident and incontestable for all of His Majesty's loyal subjects. I always declare, and particularly in this case, that, conformably to high desire, the Judgment that will be given will be most just and reasonable, and, in conclusion, I demand that justice should be done to the plaintiff."

President (to the lawyers for the defence, on Simon Effendi resuming his seat).—It is now your turn.

Izzet Effendi, the senior counsel for Moussa Bey, then rose and read a lengthy and eloquent speech, with a fine sonorous voice. His speech was much too long for reproduction, and I shall therefore confine myself to the citation of the principal points. The exordium was, as in the speech of Tinghir Effendi, a panegyric of His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, including a prayer for the preservation of the Empire from the illegal aims and intrigues of ill-wishers. He then referred to the high birth of his client, Moussa Bey, Merza Bey Zadé, a Kurdish Chieftain, of a family which had been noble for 300 or 400 years, and which had always served the Empire with loyalty, to the charges which had been preferred against him out of spite, directly and indirectly, and which had finally been echoed in the foreign press, to the fact that although the offences charged were ordinary criminal offences, attempts had been made to give them another colour, and to Moussa Bey's desire for a public trial in order that the stain thrown upon his character, which could not be removed by the "Ordonnances de Non-Lieu" given by the Judge of Instruction, should be publicly effaced and his innocence proclaimed, not only by the Court, but before the bar of public opinion, which would then be convinced that these charges circulated against him were calumnies. "As he is a civilized man," said he, "he prefers to die with honour rather than live in infamy." Izzet Effendi then proceeded to enlarge in detail upon the contradictions, discrepancies, and inconsistencies of the witnesses in the four counts

against his client, and sought to refute separately the allegations of the witnesses. These witnesses, he declared, were perjured, and he asked for Moussa Bey's acquittal.

During the speeches of the Public Prosecutor and the two lawyers, I noticed in the reserved space many officials, chiefly judicial, and lawyers, among others, their Excellencies Ibrahim Bey, Judge of the Court of Cassation; Jelal Bey, Director of Criminal Affairs in the Ministry of Justice; and Kiamil Effendi, Director of the Mint; as well as Ismail Bey and Halil Nesté Bey, Judges of the Commercial Court of Appeal and Correctional Court of First Instance, &c.

At the close of Izzet Effendi's speech, the President asked Mehemet Ali Effendi whether he had anything to say.

He replied that his speech would be very lengthy, and the Court thereupon adjourned till Monday.

The fifth and last sitting of the Court took place on Monday, the 2nd December, in the presence of the same dignitaries who had previously been present. The Judges took their seats on the Bench at 20 minutes to 12, the audience being as large as before, and in anticipation of Judgment being pronounced in this remarkable case, which it is no exaggeration to say has almost monopolized the attention of the public. Very few officials were present at the commencement of the proceedings, though afterwards many of those who had previously attended made their appearance.

On the *President* calling upon him to speak for the defence,

Mehemet Ali Effendi rose and proceeded to read a lengthy speech on behalf of Moussa Bey. After a long preamble, he proceeded to refute the charges against his client in the same way as Izzet Effendi had done, only with much more detail. His utterance being very indistinct and his voice monotonous greatly diminished the interest taken in the proceedings.

He protested strongly against the attempts which had been made to describe Moussa Bey as a savage and uncivilised person, and he called the attention of the Court to Moussa Bey's dress, manners, and general bearing in refutation of this assertion. During several centuries, he said, Moussa Bey's family had constantly, from father to son, rendered loyal service to the Imperial Government, and he himself had been a Mudir, and had faithfully performed his duties.

The enmity of the Armenians had been excited against him owing to an affair in which a married priest was engaged. There were four counts in the two actions brought against Moussa Bey, and he relied on the interrogatories at Moosh and Constantinople, especially Ibrahim Bey's inquiry, to prove that the charges against his client were trumped up. He called attention to the fact that while Moussa Bey was well-to-do, the witnesses were indigent people, who were, some of them, without work, and had stopped in Constantinople for a long time, and he characterized their evidence as mendacious.

During his detailed refutations of the alleged contradictions, Moussa Bey showed evident signs of weariness, in which the audience fully sympathized, and he was observed to remark to Izzet Bey that this speech was superfluous, as these arguments had been already presented to the Court. Finally, unable to restrain his impatience, he interrupted his lawyer by asking the President's permission to speak; but on the President pointing out that it was advisable that the defence should continue and not be interrupted, he desisted. Mehemet Ali Effendi remarked that after he had finished his speech Moussa Bey could speak, and quietly continued. At 20 minutes to 1 the Court withdrew, and the sitting recommenced half-an-hour afterwards.

Mehemet Ali Effendi continued the reading of his speech. Another incident occurred. Noticing Moussa Bey's increasing impatience, Izzet Effendi made an attempt to seize part of the voluminous brief of his brother counsel, but unsuccessfully, as the latter perceived his intention, and by a quick movement secured the papers. Moussa Bey shortly afterwards again interrupted his counsel, and expressed a desire to speak.

Mehemet Ali Effendi protested that his speech was drawing to a close, and asked to be allowed to finish it without interruption. At a quarter to 2 he concluded, with the demand for the acquittal of his client.

Moussa Bey then addressed the Court, and deprecated the lengthy pleading of his counsel. Where is the necessity of repeating all this? The trial has now lasted over a week. All those who have attended at the proceedings must know who is in the right: if they have not been convinced hitherto all the repetitions imaginable will not make them comprehend the nature of the case. Although I am of a noble family, justice is equal for all. My Lord, you have been appointed to administer justice and to carry out the law, and you have heard me and the witnesses for the prosecution. It

now remains for you to pronounce the sentence to which, whatever it is, I shall submit.

Asked by the *President* whether he had anything to say, the plaintiff *Carabet* rose to his feet, and, boldly addressing the Court, said:—

"My Lord, we are told that a gentleman like the prisoner, Moussa Bey, cannot have committed the crimes with which he is charged. This fine gentleman with the fez and black coat," said he (pointing to the accused), "is not the savage Chieftain we know in our country, and who has wrought us so much evil. Why does he not appear before your honourable Court in the wild dress in which he is known to everybody in our country? He has impoverished us, ruined our homes and families, robbed and burnt our houses, and he dares to say here that all this is not true."

President.—What more?

Carabet.—Everywhere in our country the traces of his crimes and misdeeds are to be seen.

Izzet Effendi, rising:—

"My Lord, the plaintiff has no right to talk in this manner; these declarations are irrelevant."

Carabet.—I have the right to defend my interest. If Moussa Bey knew he was not guilty, why did he not come of his own accord to defend himself during the two years and more we have been prosecuting him.

Mehemet Ali Effendi.—We ask for damages. (He then presented a document to one of the Court ushers.)

Carabet.—Since Moussa Bey has come here there are no more outrages and crimes in our country, where Kurds and Armenians live as brothers.

Moussa Bey.—I ought not to praise myself, but as he asks why I did not appear before the authorities to defend myself, I must say I remained two years at Moosh and one year at Bitlis, when Salih Pasha and Arif Pasha were Governors. He says I am now considered civilized, because I no longer wear my native dress and wear a fez; thus, according to him, all those who don't wear a fez are savages. The Persians are therefore savages because they wear black lambskin caps, and the English because they wear a hat. Whoever does not wear a fez is not a man! Everybody, when in his native country, wears its costume.

Simon Effendi then rose to address the Court:—

"I don't intend to attempt to refute Mehemet Ali Effendi's arguments, as they are simply a repetition of Izzet Bey's. I only wish for a reply to the questions I have put before the Court, which has not been given. Among other things, I asked whether the Court could take for a basis for its Judgment Ibrahim Bey's Report and the *procès-verbaux* of the depositions taken at Moosh. I also asked whether the contradictions which have been noticed in the depositions of the witnesses merely exist as regards the details or the main facts of the case. As regards the two first questions, I declare that the documents therein mentioned, once His Imperial Majesty the Sultan has decided that the case should be tried here, can have no value. As regards the last question, I maintain that the contradictions spoken of have regard only to details, and not to the main facts of the case. It is impossible that details of the crimes should be remembered by the witnesses after such a lapse of time. These witnesses are honest, simple, ignorant people, and therefore too much importance should not be attached to discrepancies in their statements, especially when the events under examination occurred about three years ago."

Simon Effendi, in conclusion, expressed the hope that the Court would not be influenced by the statements for the defence, and asked for justice to his clients.

Izzet Bey, in reply, maintained his point of view regarding the preliminary Reports of Ibrahim Bey and the *procès-verbaux* signed by the accusers at Moosh, and went to the length of asserting that the Court would have been justified in taking it as a basis for its Judgment even though it had been drawn up by one having no official character, once the plaintiff had signed it. As to the depositions of the witnesses, it was evident that they were not in agreement regarding either main facts or details. It is insinuated that as the witnesses are simple and ignorant men their errors must be pardoned, but that is inadmissible. Supposing the Mosque of Sultan Bayazid or the Seraskerate was described to a man who had never seen them, he might perhaps wrongly describe them not several days, but even an hour afterwards; but if he had seen them and were asked to describe them, he could do so even after twenty years.

Public Prosecutor (addressing the President).—As your Excellency is aware, the last word belongs to me as Public Prosecutor. Out of the points raised by Simon Effendi Tinghir there are only two which concern the Public Prosecutor. I have

already expressed my opinion as Public Prosecutor regarding this case. Although the preliminary inquiry made by his Excellency Ibrahim Bey, Judge of the Court of Cassation, has not been taken as a basis for this action, it has been borne out by the inquiry made in Court. Simon Effendi Tinghir has also stated that the contradictions are not on the main points, but in the details. When a man gives evidence he testifies to the main points of a case, and not on the details. When witnesses are subborned they are united on the main points, but their falsehood is easily understood from the details. The law has, fortunately, laid down a penalty for false witnesses.

After a few remarks from *Mehemet Ali Effendi*, to the effect that Simon Effendi Tinghir had admitted the contradictions, but had failed to point out which were on the main points and which were on the details,

Izzet Effendi made a final appeal to the Court, during which he stated that both his colleague and himself had been held up to obloquy by many conscientious people unacquainted with the true state of the case. He protested against a man being sacrificed to the violent desire for vengeance inspired in their minds by lying publications, reminded the President of the Court that justice was not to be influenced or led by opinion, and called upon the Court to correct the error into which public opinion had fallen, by declaring in its sentence the innocence and acquittal of Moussa Bey of the crimes laid to his charge.

The President, after asking on both sides if they had anything more to say, and receiving an answer in the negative, declared the trial over, and withdrew with the other Judges into the deliberation room about 2·10. Exactly an hour later the Judges returned to their seats.

President.—Moussa Bey, listen to the decision concerning you that will now be read as the result of the trial.

Azmy Bey, Clerk of the Court, then read the following decision :—

"After hearing the claims and defence of both sides, perusing and examining the documents of the interrogatory, the case has been deliberated upon, and, as will be shown in the detailed record and in the Judgment to be drawn up, considering that the evidence which has been given as to the actions of which Moussa Bey stands accused, is conflicting and cannot be looked upon as quite sufficient to insure conviction, and whereas of these actions, as regards the arson and extortion, a majority has not been obtained, and as regards the burglary unanimity has been obtained, while on the murder of Malkhass a majority of two-thirds for his culpability has not been obtained, decision has been given for his acquittal and his release if he is not detained on another charge."

President (to Guards).—Release Moussa Bey.

Two or three persons in the audience then shouted "Long live the Sultan," and the proceedings terminated.

(Signed) JUSTIN ALVAREZ.

Constantinople, December 6, 1889.

Annex 1.

Translation of Report of Chamber of Accusation in the Case "Migherditch v. Moussa Bey."

IN the presence of the President, Hussein Ruschdy Effendi, and the members, Neschet and Hyder Effendis, of the Correctional Court of Appeal, sitting as Chamber of Accusation, and of Raouf Bey, Assistant Prosecutor to the Court, sitting *in camera*, the conclusion of the Constantinople Instruction (*i.e.*, Interrogation) Department, inclosed in Objection 5049, dated the 15th Reby-ul-Ewel, 1307 (28th October, 1305), of the Public Prosecutor to Appeal Courts, and a further objection to this conclusion on the part of the Public Prosecutor of Stamboul and Migherditch Ohanessian, private prosecutor, were all examined and found to be within the delay allowed by law. They were read by Memduh Bey, Clerk of the Court. The conclusion was to the effect that the Kurd, Moussa Bey, was accused of having gone to the village of Ardank, in the Sandjak of Moosh, and of having set fire to a store belonging to Migherditch, son of Ohannes, containing agricultural implements, clothes, and other property, and to hay and wood on the outside, as well as to the stacks of barley in the "harman;" also of having entered his house by making a hole in the wall, and of having stolen his goods, and also of having violently extorted 20 liras by tying up his elder brother and father and threatening them, and that the result of the

interrogatories showed that the evidence was conflicting and false; and as was shown in a despatch of the 30th August, 1305, from the Assistant Public Prosecutor of Bitlis, Migherditch's father, Ohannes, had previously applied to the authorities of Moosh, stating that, at the instigation of Moussa Bey or his relative, Suleiman Bey, on the night of the 16th July, 1303, the hay and other property in the straw-store were burnt, and, while he was unable to prove that this straw-store was burnt at the instigation of the aforesaid, the fact that Migherditch maintained that on this occasion Moussa Bey in person burnt the stacks of hay in this straw-store; the fact that he endeavoured to prove his case by producing witnesses to that effect; and the fact that he stated, though at Bitlis on the night of fire, that he with his own eyes saw Moussa Bey commit the arson, showed what was the real nature of the case; and, therefore, as it was evident that conflicting evidence could not be looked upon as legal proof, the conclusion stated that an "Ordonnance de Non-Lieu" had been issued in favour of the accused, Moussa Bey.

The contents in brief of the Public Prosecutor of Stamboul's objection were that, notwithstanding the "Ordonnance de Non-Lieu" given in favour of Moussa Bey, in consequence of conflict and contradiction in the statements of the witnesses whose depositions were taken down concerning the action for arson and theft of Migherditch, son of Ohannes, against Moussa Bey, during the interrogatories and investigations, the appreciation of this lay in the hands of a special authority, and the annulment of the "Ordonnance de Non-Lieu" was demanded, it not appearing conformable to law. Migherditch Ohannesian's objection stated that the "Ordonnance de Non-Lieu" given by the Judge of Instruction was irregular, demanded its annulment, and a searching and thorough investigation to bring the truth to light.

The contents of the Objection of the Public Prosecutor of the Appeal Court state that, notwithstanding that the evidence and depositions of the witnesses are contradictory, and the different depositions of Migherditch, who considers himself a private prosecutor, and who now has signed the Petition containing his opposition to the Order of the Judge of Instruction as a denouncer, tend to bear out the falsity of his claim, yet, as is stated in the Objection of the Public Prosecutor of the Court of First Instance, the appreciation of the evidence rests with the Court that will try the case; and as, according to the evidence given, the action of Moussa Bey, that calls for the heaviest penalty, is in accordance with Article 163 of the Penal Code, opposition is made by the Public Prosecutor of the Appeal Court against this "Ordonnance de Non-Lieu," of which he demands the annulment, as well as the indictment of Moussa Bey. Seeing that Migherditch has expressly stated, by his signature to his opposition, that he is a denouncer, by law he has no right of opposition, and it must therefore be rejected. After examining other documents, the Assistant Prosecutor repeated and supported the opinion expressed in this Objection; and the Clerk of the Court having handed to the Chamber all documents in the case, they both withdrew. Deliberation was then begun, and decision was unanimously given on the 17th Reby-ul-Ewel, 1307 (30th October, 1305), for the rejection of Migherditch's Petition against the "Ordonnance de Non-Lieu," seeing that his signature declared him a denouncer, and he consequently had no legal right to make opposition; for the annulment of the Judge of Instruction's "Ordonnance de Non-Lieu," conformably to the Objections of the Public Prosecutors, both of the Courts of First Instance and Appeal, as the Judge of Instruction, taking upon himself to appreciate the evidence of those witnesses whose depositions are recorded, is an assumption of the duties of a Court, and therefore illegal, for the criminal accusation of the suspect, Moussa Bey, as there are sufficient circumstances to warrant his accusation; and as the action that calls for the heaviest penalty is seen to be a criminal one, requiring the application of Article 163, he is to take his trial in the Criminal Court, in accordance with the tenour of the clauses of section 2, chapter IV, of the Law on Criminal Procedure, and for the drawing up of a warrant for his arrest. The requisite warrant for his arrest has been made out, as is communicated, together with other documents.

Annex 2.

Translation of the Report of the Chamber of Accusation and the Indictment of Moussa Bey for the Murder of Malkhass.

In the presence of the President, Hussein Ruschdy Effendi, and the members, Mehemet Bey and Kapriel Effendi, of the Correctional Court of Appeal, sitting as Chamber of Accusation, and of Memduh Bey, Assistant Prosecutor of the Court, the conclusion of the Constantinople Instruction Department, inclosed in Objection 5111, dated the 26 Reby-ul-Ewel, 1307 (8th November, 1305), of the Public Prosecutor to Appeal Courts, and a further Objection to this conclusion on the part of the Public Prosecutor of Stamboul and other documents, were examined and found to be within the delay allowed by law. They were read by Memduh Bey, Clerk of the Court. The conclusion was to the effect that the Kurd, Moussa Bey, was accused of having wounded and killed the miller Malkhass, son of Arslan, of the village of Ardank, in the Sandjak of Moosh, but that notwithstanding the witnesses Gaspar and Temedre, priests, stated in the course of the instruction that Moussa Bey committed this crime, there were numerous contradictions in their depositions, and no motive had been shown for Malkhass being murdered by Moussa Bey, and supposing Moussa Bey had a grudge against Malkhass, seeing that on account of the great distance off them, the priests Gaspar and Temedre deposed that they did not recognize Malkhass and the men with him, and it is therefore far from probable that Moussa Bey should from such a distance distinguish Malkhass, pick him out from his companions, take aim at him and fire, and seeing that Ussob, son of the deceased Malkhass, both before and afterwards, declared that Moussa Bey had sent men in search of the criminal; that Malkhass did not die in consequence, but did subsequently after an illness of fourteen days; that Moussa Bey had no hand in his death; and that, notwithstanding the instigation of several Armenians to make complaint, he was afraid of God, and could not slander Moussa Bey, and had Moussa Bey caused the wound, and the wounded man died of the effects of the wound, it is evident that his heirs would have informed the Government, and an action would have been brought against him; whereas, until the complainant, Kumasch Cadyn, came to Constantinople with Moussa Bey's other prosecutors, no heir of the deceased brought an action, and the heirs denied the denunciation, made out of spite, as is evident from local information. From all the depositions, it is clear that there was no examination of the deceased, and consequently Gaspar and Temedre's evidence is weakened by numerous proofs, appears divested of truth, and cannot be considered acceptable testimony on an "Ordonnance de Non-Lieu" as regards Moussa Bey's trial has been given, as legal proofs of crime are wanting.

The substance of the objection of the Public Prosecutor of Stamboul referred to the decision of the Judge of Instruction, that on account of the conflict and contradiction between the declarations made against the Kurd, Moussa Bey, who was accused of the wounding and killing of Malkhass, there was no credible evidence against him, and demanded the annulment of this decision as not conformable to law, the appreciation of evidence belonging to the Court. The contents in brief of the Public Prosecutor of the Appeal Court's objection were of similar purport, and a demand was made for the accusation of Moussa Bey criminally, as his action was described as crime in Article 105 of the Penal Code.

After examination of the other papers and support of the last objection by the Assistant Prosecutor, the Clerk of the Court handed all the documents to the Chamber, and they both withdrew. In deliberation, decision was unanimously given on the 26th Reby-ul-Ewel, 1307 (8th November, 1305), for the indictment (accusation) criminally of Moussa Bey, who was to take his trial before the Criminal Court conformably to the tenour of section 2, chapter IV, of the Law on Criminal Procedure, according to Objection, seeing that the Judge of Instruction, taking upon himself the appreciation of the evidence, which is one of the legal duties of a Court, and issuing an "Ordonnance de Non-Lieu" on the ground of conflicting evidence, is illegal, and that there is sufficient evidence in the documents of the inquiry against the suspect, Moussa Bey, to warrant his indictment under Article 170 of the Penal Code, and for the issue of a warrant for his arrest, there being in the papers handed in nothing to show he is in prison. The requisite warrant for his arrest was made out, and was communicated with the other documents.

Indictment.

As is described in detail in the Report of the Chamber of Accusation, dated the 9th November, 1305, containing the legal interrogatories and inquiries of the

Instruction Department of the Constantinople Court of First Instance, concerning the Kurd, Moussa Bey, accused of wounding and killing Malkhass, son of Arslan, of the village of Ardank, Sandjak of Moosh, according to the evidence of the priests Gaspard and Temetre, it has been shown that Moussa Bey wilfully wounded and murdered Malkhass, and Moussa Bey is therefore indicted as a wilful murderer.

27th Reby-ul-Ewel, 1307 (*November* 9, 1305).

No. 106.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received December* 25.)

(No. 197.)

My Lord, *Constantinople, December* 12, 1889.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 475 of the 27th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith a translation of the three copies of the official Turkish Judicial Journal, giving the continuation of the interrogatory of Moussa Bey.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 106.

Depositions.

Deposition on Oath of the Witness Agop, Son of Parmatian, Labourer, Native of the Village of Ardank.

WITNESS stated that he was living in Vezir Khan, and that he was 65 years of age.

Q. Have you any complaint against Moussa Bey, and has he done you any wrong?—*A.* He has done me no wrong, and I have no claim against him.

Q. With whom did you come to Constantinople?—*A.* I came with Kerebit, the brother of Migherditch. Kerebit paid my expenses.

Q. What did you come for?—*A.* I came to bear witness.

Q. State what you know?—*A.* Three years ago, one night, at about 3·30 or 4, as I was sitting on the threshing-floor, I saw smoke rising up. I supposed it was a fire, and went towards it, and as I looked a flame sprang up and lit up the whole place. I saw Moussa Bey, with Omar Bey, holding lighted candles in their hands, urge their horses along and set fire to the hay belonging to the priest, Migherditch. Chalo Murad was also there on horseback, and other persons on foot, but I did not know they were there. I called out "Fire!" and the people of the village came. The others moved off and got away. There were two servants in the barn. These they saved, but the barn and the hay were burnt.

Q. Was your threshing-floor near that of Migherditch?—*A.* 200 or 300 yards off. But the floors are all in a row.

Q. That is to say, then, there are other floors between yours and that of Ohannes. How many floors are there?—*A.* There are six in between.

Q. How many are there in the village?—*A.* Each house has its threshing-floor. In our village there are seventy or eighty houses, and, therefore, seventy or eighty threshing-floors.

Q. Does the whole of the population of the village live on the threshing-floors?—*A.* Everybody sleeps on his own threshing-floor.

Q. How was it that you saw what happened, while the others did not?—*A.* Boghos had already gone, and when I saw it I called out.

Q. Boghos says that only he saw anything, and no one else of the inhabitants?—*A.* No; God knows I saw it with my own eyes.

Q. What kind of horse was Omar Bey on?—Moussa Bey's was white, Omar's grey, and Chalo Murad was on a bay.

Q. Did you see a candle in Chalo Murad's hand, too?—*A.* I saw candles in the hands of Omar and Moussa, but not in Murad's.

Q. Is Boghos' threshing-floor next to yours?—*A.* No; it is nearer to Ohannes' than to mine.

Q. Where was the smoke you saw rising from?—*A.* The smoke I saw rose from the barn. When I went there the barn was on fire. Moussa Boy and Omar Bey held their candles to the hay. This caught fire first and the barn afterwards.

Q. Sign this declaration of yours.—*A.* I don't know how to write, and I have no seal. I can place my finger there.

(Mark of Agop.)

(Signed) AHMED, *Recording Clerk.*
HUSSEIN SADKI, *Juge d'Instruction.*

Declaration on Oath of the Witness Ohannes, Son of Makhtarian, Miller, Native of the Village of Ardank.

Witness stated that he was living in the café of Eyi Azik, in the nailmakers' Ivazian quarter of Kassim Pasha; and that he was 45 years old. Made on the 14th September, 1305.

Q. When did you come to Stamboul?—*A.* Nine months ago. I worked in Ivanserai, but have left now.

Q. Have you any relations with Migherditch, priest of the village of Ardank?—*A.* No; but he is of the same village as I am.

Q. Have you any complaint against Moussa Boy; has he done you any wrong?—*A.* No; he has done me no wrong. I have no complaint against him.

Q. Do you know whether he has wronged any one else?—*A.* I don't know. I know of the affair of Migherditch.

Q. What do you know?—*A.* Two years ago at St. Demetrius' (Kassimwakti), time, one night, at about half-past 4, Moussa Bey, Omar Bey, Murad, and some others whom I do not know, pierced the wall of Migherditch's house, entered, and carried off crockery, linen, and other articles.

Q. What sort of articles did they carry away?—*A.* Women's and clothes.

Q. With what did Moussa Bey pierce the wall?—*A.* Moussa Bey, his son-in-law, Omar Bey, and Murad made a hole with sticks and got in.

Q. How many minutes did they take?—*A.* About ten minutes or a quarter of an hour.

Q. Was the hole large?—*A.* About half-a-fathom.

Q. Who got in first?—*A.* Omar Bey first; then Murad. Moussa Bey stood on the roof, and waited for the others outside.

Q. Who came out first?—*A.* Omar Bey came out first with the things, followed by Murad.

Q. Did Omar come out with the things on his back?—*A.* He threw them out one by one and in bundles, and then came out himself.

Q. Then, when did Moussa come down from the roof?—*A.* Omar and Murad came out and Moussa got down, and they went away together.

Q. Were they on horseback or on foot?—*A.* They were all on foot.

Q. Is Moussa's village near you?—*A.* About half-an-hour distant.

Q. How did they carry the things?—The others, that is, Omar, Murad, and the rest, excepting Moussa, carried them.

Q. How far is it from your house to that of Migherditch?—About 200 paces.

Q. Were you asleep when they came?—No; I was in my room. I saw a knot of persons, and went and saw what was going on. He said, "Be off, or we will kill you." This frightened me, and I went away.

Q. Did no one come from the village before they went away?—*A.* The villagers came an hour after they had gone. We went into Migherditch's house to look, and saw they had taken away the things.

Q. When they threatened you, and told you to go away, where did you go?—*A.* I went straight home, and, in my fear, I told nobody.

Q. Do you never sleep till half-past 4?—*A.* Oh, yes; but sometimes, from fear, I wander about the village, and on that night I was sometimes looking outside and sometimes staying in my room.

Q. Did you know Moussa, Omar, and Murad previously?—*A.* Yes.

Q. Did Moussa do anything else to Migherditch, and Ohannes, his brother?—*A.* I don't know. I only saw this; this I know.

Q. Was not the store of Migherditch burnt?—*A.* It was; but at that time I was at Constantinople.

Q. Is the wall thick?—*A.* About a yard thick (less than 30 inches).

Q. Of brick, or of stone?—*A.* Of stone.

Q. How can you bore through a stone wall 3 feet thick in a quarter of an hour?—*A.* The (thick) sticks they had in their hands had iron tips about a span in length.

Q. You say you saw a group of persons; you went and saw what they were doing. They told you to go, and threatened you, and you returned home. You add that they made the hole in a quarter of an hour, and that the house of Migherditch is 200 paces off. Now, how did you see in the dark, from such a distance, who came out of the hole first and who came out last, and what sort of things were brought out?—*A.* That is what I saw.

Q. Is it possible to see like that?—*A.* It was light.

Q. Before or after Kassim?—*A.* I don't know.

Q. Sign your declaration.—*A.* I cannot write, and I have no seal. Let me place my finger on it.

(Ohannes laid his finger here.)

(Signed) AHMED.
HUSSEIN SADKI.

Deposition on Oath of the Witness Manas, Son of Malkonian, taken down after Interpretation by Boghdian Effendi, 25 years of age.

Witness stated that he worked as a miller in a mill on Pasha Harbour in Scutari, that he was a native of Ardank, and that he was 25 years of ago. Made on the 14th September, 1305.

Q. Have you worked in any other mill?—*A.* I have worked in mills in Jibali and Yéni Kapoo.

Q. When did you come to Constantinople?—*A.* Eight months ago.

Q. Had you been here before?—*A.* Once when I was little.

Q. Are you related to Migherditch, of the village of Ardank?—*A.* No.

Q. Have you any complaint against the Kurd, Moussa Bey?—*A.* No; I have come as a witness.

Q. Do you know whether Moussa wronged any one else?—*A.* I only saw him do harm to Migherditch.

Q. Say what he did to him.—*A.* A year and a-half ago in the winter, at Christmas, at about 11 o'clock on a Saturday, Moussa, Omar, Jezair Bey, Murad, and about fifteen others, attacked his house. Moussa seized Migherditch's father, Ohannes, and his brother Carabet, tied them both to a post, and demanded 20 liras, threatening to burn down his house if they refused to give the money. The wife of Carabet went with her daughter-in-law, Vartersi, to her village, and found the 20 liras. She also collected a similar sum in our village. She gave 20 liras to Moussa, who, as soon as he received them, let the men go, mounted his horse, and rode away with his companions. That is what I know.

Q. How long did Ohannes and Carabet remain tied?—*A.* Two or three hours passed while the money was being collected and brought.

Q. Did Moussa and his men sleep that night in the house of Makradijian?—*A.* When he had got the money they mounted and rode off.

Q. When the men were tied did they call the villagers?—*A.* Nobody dared to go and call them.

Q. How were you there?—*A.* I was looking at Moussa's horses outside.

Q. How was it you came there? Did they call you?—*A.* When the people had found the money they brought it, and came to beg Moussa to let the men go, and as I was with them I came, too.

Q. Just now you said everybody was afraid to go; now you say they came?—*A.* At first they had not the courage, but when they had collected the money they brought it.

Q. Sign your declaration.—*A.* I cannot write.

Q. Do you know of any other misdeed of Moussa's?—*A.* No.

Q. Was Makradijian's store burnt?—*A.* I was asleep at the time; when I awoke I saw there was a fire, but do not know who was the author of the fire.

Q. Will you put your signature to this statement?—*A.* I cannot write, but it is no secret, and I will place my finger upon the seal.

This statement has been made by Munas, and interpreted by me, Bogdik.

(Munas has placed his finger upon the seal.)

(Signed) AHMET.
HUSSEIN SADKI.

A man was summoned to appear as witness from Scutari from the Sultan Vali farm at Pasha Liman. He stated that he was a native of Ardank, 20 years of age, and employed at present at the Sultan Vali farm. His name was Bigos, son of Artan. The following is a report of the statement he made upon oath after undergoing examination, Bogdik Effendi acting as interpreter:—

Q. When did you come to Constantinople?—*A.* A year ago.

Q. Had you any relationship or connection with the villager, Migherditch?—*A.* He is from the same village, but not related to me in any way.

Q. Have you any charge to bring against Moussa Bey, and has he injured you in any way?—*A.* Not at all; and I have no complaint to make against him.

Q. Are you aware of any injury done by him to any person or persons?—*A.* I remember that one night about two years and a-half ago, in the month of October, at a late hour in the night, we were sitting together in Migherditch's room. I myself, together with Okhan, son of Mimo, Murat, son of Kirkor, and another Okhan, son of Shero, had been upon my rounds to see that all was well in the village. We had come into Migherditch's room to rest. Suddenly the dogs began to bark furiously in the street, and Okhan, son of Mimo, and I ran out to see what was the matter. We saw a man upon the roof of Migherditch's house. I asked him who he was; he told me to hold my tongue, or he would shoot me. He had a cudgel in his hand, and was making a hole in the roof. This man was Moussa Bey. I recognized him by his voice and could even see his face, for there was a bright moonlight. When I saw Moussa Bey I was terrified, and crossed straight over the road opposite the house. Then I saw seven other persons lurking about. Among these I recognized Amr Bey, Chalo Murad, and Hussno, son of Haji Pramon. The others I did not recognize. These men, with the exception of two or three, entered the house through the roof, and brought out the goods belonging to its owner. But I do not know what they were. They then proceeded to pack up what they had stolen, and all went off together. Finding that the people of the house were asleep we awoke them, and told them what had happened, and then went home. This is all I know, and I bear witness to it.

Q. Who was in Migherditch's room when you entered?—*A.* Migherditch's brothers, Ibrahim and Ginas, and his father, Okhans, and their wives.

Q. Were they sitting in the room?—*A.* They were asleep.

Q. If they were asleep and the door shut, how did you enter?—*A.* The door of the room is distinct from the khan door. The men I have mentioned were in the khan, and the door being open we entered the room.

Q. When you saw the thieves, why did you not give the master of the house the alarm?—*A.* Because Moussa Bey said, "If you utter a sound I will shoot you," so I was afraid, and retired.

Q. The roof has a chimney; why did they not enter by that?—*A.* The chimney is high up; they could not descend from it. They got in through a hole in the corner of the roof.

Q. Whether they entered by the chimney or the hole they must descend, so why did they make a hole?—*A.* The middle of the roof is high, but at the eaves it is only the height of an ordinary man. By knocking out a couple of stones, any one could get down into the room.

Q. Did they pass what they had stolen through the hole they had made?—*A.* Yes.

Q. How did they manage to pass it through a hole five or six feet from the ground?—*A.* They enlarged the hole before passing the things through.

Q. Were the robbers seen by Okhan and the other Okhan, and by Murad, too?—*A.* They saw nothing. Okhan, son of Mimo, who ran out with me, saw them.

Q. Is this Okhan now at Constantinople?—*A.* He is.

Q. Is that Okhan whose statement we lately took down Okhanis, son of Mukhtar?—*A.* Yes.

Q. Okhanis declares that you were the only man who saw the thieves?—*A.* We were together; he must have seen them.

Q. Okhanis says that he was not in Migherditch's room that night; he was in his own?—*A.* What can I say? It may have been so.

Q. Sign this statement.—*A.* I cannot read, but I will lay my finger upon the document.

(Bigos has placed his finger upon this.)

BIGOS.

This statement has been taken with myself for interpreter.

(Signed) BOGDIK.

Q. Do you know of any other outrage committed by Moussa Bey?—*A.* I am not aware of any; they say he has committed others, but I cannot tell.

Q. Sign this statement.

(Bigos has laid his finger upon this.)

I have acted as interpreter.

(Signed) BOGDIK.

(Signed) BOGDIK.
SADKI HUSSEIN.
AHMED.

The following is the statement of Moussa Bey and his examination, 2nd July, 1305 (Mah):—

Q. What is your name and your father's name, where were you born, and how old are you?—*A.* My name is Moussa Bey, my father's, Muza Bey; my native place is the village of Ziniar, in the Province of Moosh. I am between 34 and 35 years of age. I was Mudir for some time; I am now Revenue-farmer, and am married. I have three wives, two sons and two daughters. I am possessed of five farms and one house.

Q. You are accused of having set fire, about three years ago, after harvest-time, to the barn of the Ardank villager, Okhanis, and burnt his hay and his store-house?—*A.* I know nothing about it.

Q. Several persons have borne witness to the statement that you, along with your brother, Jezair Bey, and your brother-in-law, Amr Bey, and Chalo Murad, and a few other Kurds, went to Ardank and burnt the barn and hay and store of this Okhanis?—*A.* Jezair Bey was at that time only 11 years old, and I was carrying on a law-suit at Moosh with my uncle, Suleiman Bey. I was at Moosh, and neither I nor Jezair Bey know anything about this matter.

Q. How long did you stay at Moosh?—*A.* I stayed there two years; after that I moved to Bitlis, in accordance with orders received from the Porte. There I remained one year, and then came to Constantinople.

Q. Did this Okhanis bring no charge against you at that time?—*A.* He came about then to Moosh, and informed the Government of the fire through which he had suffered. But he did not accuse me, and I was asked no questions about the matter by the Government.

Q. Several persons from Ardank assert that you were the author of the fire?—*A.* Those who had disputes with me are among those who make this assertion. They have in their possession papers to show that they were at law with me in Bitlis and Moosh.

Q. How do you know who are your accusers?—*A.* The inhabitants of two or three villages got up law-suits against me. These are intimate with my accusers.

Q. It is further stated that you, along with Amr Bey and Chalo Murad, and some others of your associates, two years after the fire, went one night and broke through the wall of Okhanis' house, and entered it. After which you took and carried away everything you could lay your hands upon?—*A.* Nothing of the kind occurred as far as I am aware. I know that the Government was informed of my having perpetrated this crime, but it is not my place to say what the Government thought of it. The real cause of the charge was the fact of Migherditch's having murdered his brother's wife, and, as my father was at that time Governor of the place, he endeavoured to arrest Migherditch and bring him to trial. But he escaped to Constantinople, and never returned to his country.

Q. You are further charged with having, two or three months after the robbery of Migherditch's house, gone one evening, together with Amr Bey and Chalo Murad,

and several others, to the house of this Okhanis. They say that you tied his eldest son with a rope, and five or six hours later you took the 20 liras Okhanis had managed to accumulate, and went off with them?—*A.* A year before the time when these things, as they declare, happened, I gave Okhanis 30 bushels of seed and 100 liras in money, in order that we might afterwards divide the value of the produce according to the custom of the country. This seed he was to sow in his own fields, as is the usual custom, and then, when the grain was ripe, we were to divide it fairly between ourselves. The 100 liras he was to pay me back after the produce had been disposed of. He did pay them back, and divided the crops fairly with me. But with the money I had furnished him without interest we planted a melon field. Melons are not sold for money in those parts, but are exchanged for wheat. Okhanis sold the melon field for wheat, and my share in the wheat ought to have been 25 bushels. I had no claim on those melons which were not disposed of; they belonged to Okhanis. That year I was engaged in my law-suit with Suleiman Bey, and after finishing that I went home again. I sent Chalo Murad to Okhanis, and heard about the melons and wheat. Okhanis' son, Carabet, came to me along with Murad and two or three villagers, and I asked them about the melons and wheat. They said they had brought no wheat, and on my inquiring their reason, Carabet took 40 medjidies out of his pocket, and handed them to me. I said it was little, but finally agreed to accept it. This is how it all happened; but I certainly never went to Okhanis' house and bound his son or took away his 20 liras, as they assert. But a year ago Carabet went to Moosh, and, after presenting a Petition stating that I had taken 40 medjidies from him by force, instituted law proceedings against me. The Juge d'Instruction of Moosh examined me, and in the course of his investigations came to the conclusion that these 40 medjidies were rightly owed me, and that Carabet had brought them to me of his own free will. Thereupon, Carabet returned to his village.

Q. Sign this statement?—*A.* I will seal it.

(Sealed) MOUSSA BEY.

(Signed) AHMED.
HUSSEIN SADIKI.

In the letters sent by the Procureur-Général of Moosh in answer to the Ministry of Justice, dated the 16th Moharrem, 1308, and the 30th August, 1305, bearing the No. 23, it is stated that a charge was brought by Okhanis, son of Kharchik, native of Ardank, against Moussa Bey, and one of his relations, the late Suleiman Bey. He accused them of having, on the night of the 16th July, 1303, burnt his barn, along with the hay and farm implements it contained. But as sufficient proof was not forthcoming, and some of the persons summoned to appear as witnesses could not be present, no definite verdict could be given, and the case was dismissed.

(Signed) HUSSEIN SADIKI.

July 27, 1305.

The following is the report of another statement furnished by the prosecutor, Migherditch, son of Okhanis, the 30th July, 1305:—

Q. When you made your former statement, you told us of a witness named Onan. Where is this witness?—*A.* I said Okhanis, not Onan, and Okhanis has appeared. You have taken down his statement. I mentioned him as my witness; you have taken a report of his statement.

Q. Your father Okhanis brought an action at Moosh to obtain damages for the burning of the barn. He said that the barn was burnt either by Moussa Bey, or at the instigation of his relative, the late Suleiman Bey. But it seems that as proofs were wanting, the trial could not proceed?—*A.* Moussa Bey said, "I did not do it; Suleiman Bey did it." Suleiman Bey said, "I did not do it; Moussa Bey did it." Moussa Bey urged us not to prosecute him, and so we withheld our proofs. Moussa Bey did it. I demand my property from him, so have no claim against Suleiman Bey.

Q. Sign this?—*A.* I cannot write, but will lay my hand upon it.

(Migherditch, son of Ohannes, has laid his hand upon this.)

(Signed) SADIKI HUSSEIN.
AHMED.

Inclosure 2 in No. 106.

(Translation.)

Report of the Public Prosecutor of the Court of First Instance in Constantinople, and Judge's Decision of the "Juge d'Instruction" in the case of the three Petitions presented on behalf of Ohannes and his son Carabet, of the village of Ardank, in the Sandjak of Moosh.

Report of the Public Prosecutor.

IN the case of the complaints made against Moussa Bey by Migherditch Ohannesian, of the village of Ardank, who alleges that the said Moussa Bey came with companions by night to Ardank, and burnt a barn of complainant's, and implements and clothes and other property inside it, and firewood and straw stacks outside; and that he entered complainant's house by boring a hole in the wall, and stole property from the house; and that, one evening, he came to complainant's house, and tied up complainant's elder brother and father, and extorted 20 liras from them by threats. We have perused the record of the inquiry by the "Juge d'Instruction."

Though it appears from this record that the statements of the witnesses, who appear as "parties civiles," are contradictory, and are denied by Moussa Bey, yet, the case demanding further inquiry, and the most serious of the alleged crimes, namely, that of arson, coming under the 163rd Article of the Criminal Code, the decision of a higher Court on the case is requested, according to the 128th Article of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Office of the Public Prosecutor, Constantinople, 24th of month Safar, year 1307 (*October* 7, 1305).

Decision of the "Juge d'Instruction."

In the case of Moussa Bey, aged 35 years, Chief of Kurds of the village of Jinar, in the Sandjak of Moosh, who has been living for some months past in Constantinople, accused by Migherditch of the crimes of arson, robbery, and extortion, we have perused the foregoing Report.

The said Migherditch is not provided with the power to act for his father, Ohannes, the owner of the property alleged to have been destroyed and stolen, who is still living. Migherditch said that, three years ago, in the season of corn threshing, one night, at 6 o'clock (Turkish time), he was sleeping in his house in the village of Ardank, when news of a fire having broken out was brought to him by Boghos, one of the villagers; that thereupon he got up and went out, and found his barn on fire, and Moussa Bey and his companions surrounding the barn and preventing any one from putting the fire out; and clothes and other property stored in the barn for fear of robbers attacking the dwelling-houses, and three stacks of hay and one stack of firewood outside, and thirty-five cartloads of barley straw on the threshing-floor, were burnt also; that Boghos and Agop, of the same village, had been eye-witnesses of Moussa Bey setting fire to these things; that a complaint had been brought before the local Court, but the villagers had been afraid to give evidence against Moussa Bey, and the charge had consequently not been proved. That two months later, when he (Migherditch) was at Stamboul, Moussa Bey, at half-past 4 one night, bored a hole in the wall of his house in Ardank, and stole property from the house; that the room from which the property was stolen was not the room in which the inmates of the house were sleeping; and besides his mother, no one else saw the thieves.

On being questioned, he changed his story and said that his mother did not see Moussa Bey inside the house, but heard his voice from outside, and knew him from the voice; that the thieves carried away the stolen property, and Boghos Vartanian, and Minass, and Hadji Kivork saw them do it; that his father, Ohannes, was informed of the theft shortly afterwards, and no complaint was made to the local authorities. That two and a-half months after the robbery, Moussa Bey went to his house and tied up his brother and his father, and extorted from them 20 liras; and that another Ohannes, surnamed Onan, was in Stamboul to give evidence of these facts, as well as Boghos Bedinkian, to give evidence of the arson.

In the preliminary inquiry held by Ibrahim Bey, the same witness had said that, on the night of the fire, he was at Bitlis, and that he did not know the names of the persons who had seen Moussa Bey commit the arson, and that the robbery from the house was committed by Moussa Bey's men.

The witness, on his attention being called to this former evidence, said that it was true he was at Bitlis on the night of the fire, that he did not see Moussa Bey commit the arson, and he had asserted the contrary by mistake; that as to his not having told Ibrahim Bey the names of the persons who had seen the arson being committed, he could not have been sure of the names till his brother had come from his native place and told him them. With regard to the robbery, he said further that it was not necessary for Moussa Bey to come to the village with his men, but he had given them orders and directed their actions.

On being questioned, Moussa Bey said that he had lived two years at Moosh, and was at Moosh on the night of the fire; that Ohannes, whose hay had been burnt, brought his complaint before the Moosh authorities, but did not institute any proceedings against him (Moussa Bey); that as to the property alleged to have been robbed, he knew nothing about it, and his brother, Jezair Bey, who was accused of complicity in the crimes, was at the time in question a child of 11 years of age. As to the alleged extortion, he said that Ohannes and himself had joined together to buy a garden and a field, and Ohannes being in his debt, on account of this transaction he sent his man to ask Ohannes to send him, in satisfaction of the debt, 25 kilog. of wheat and 600 water melons; that, instead, Ohannes sent him, through his son Carabet, 40 silver medjidiehs in part payment, and there was not a word of truth in the story of his having gone to Ohannes' house and having extorted the money; that Carabet had brought the complaint of extortion before the Moosh Courts, but it had been ascertained there that Carabet had paid the money of his own free will, and that these charges had been trumped up against him out of spite by the Armenians.

Boghos and Agop, who, according to Migherditch's evidence, had seen the circumstances of the fire, were sworn:—

Boghos said that three years before, on the night of the 24th July, about 5 o'clock, he was sitting in his threshing-floor smoking a cigarette, when he saw fire coming from the threshing-floor of Migherditch, which was situated at a distance of one threshing-floor from his own; that on going to the spot he saw Migherditch's barn on fire and Moussa Bey on horseback, with a paper in his hand, setting fire to the haystacks, and beside Moussa Bey was his brother, Jezair Bey, and Amr Bey and seven other men; that thereupon he shouted, "Moussa Bey is setting fire to Migherditch's barn, and to his hay and threshing-floor;" that then the villagers came up, and Moussa Bey ran off, firing some shots in the air.

On being further questioned, the witness changed his story, and said he did not shout when he was near Moussa Bey, but went to some distance from the fire and then shouted; that Moussa Bey had gone when the villagers came to the fire, and besides himself no one saw Moussa Bey.

Agop said that one night, about half-past 3 or 4, he was sitting on his threshing-floor, when he saw smoke rising, and having gone to the smoke, found there was a fire; that he saw Moussa Bey and Amr Bey, with tapers in their hands, galloping their horses about and setting fire to the hay of Migherditch's father, Ohannes; that he (Agop) shouted, "There is a fire; come," whereupon the villagers came, and Moussa Bey and his companions went off; that when he (Agop) reached Migherditch's threshing-floor only the barn was on fire; that then Moussa Bey and Amr Bey set fire to the hay; and, lastly, the threshing-floor caught fire; that his threshing-floor was 200 or 300 arshins distant from Migherditch's. On his attention being called to Boghos' statement, that no one but himself (Boghos) had seen Moussa Bey, the witness said that Boghos had gone before he came, and he (witness) saw Moussa Bey, and then shouted. Thus, the two witnesses contradict each other. Both witnesses said that their expenses of coming to Stamboul had been defrayed by Carabet, brother of the said Migherditch.

It appears from a communication sent to us from the Office of the Public Prosecutor at Moosh that the fire took place on the 16th July, not on the 24th July, as the witness Boghos stated.

Hajji Kevork and Minass, who, according to Migherditch, knew about the robbery from his house, said they knew nothing of the robbery.

Hajji Kevork said that about twenty-two months ago, on a winter evening at 11 o'clock, Moussa Bey and Amr Bey, and their followers, Challo Murad and Haso, and another Haso, and five other men whose names he did not know, entered Migherditch's room and tied up his father and brother, and extorted by violence 20 liras, and he saw them tied up when he went with some other villagers to beg Moussa Bey to set them free.

Minass said that one and a-half years ago, during the fast of the Pascalia, on a

Saturday evening at 11 o'clock, Moussa Bey and Jezair Bey and Challo Murad, and with them about fifteen other men, entered Migherditch's house and extorted 20 liras, as the other witnesses said; that he saw Carabet and Ohannes tied up, and that because of their terror none of the inhabitants of the village had gone to Migherditch's house while this was going on. Being asked how, if that was so, he had himself ventured to enter the house so as to see Carabet and Ohannes tied up to the pillars, the witness changed his story, and said that he was walking Moussa Bey's horses up and down when the villagers came to beg Moussa Bey to set free Carabet and Ohannes, and he joined these villagers, and entered the house with them.

These two witnesses, Hajji Kevork and Minass, gave no evidence about the robbery of property from the house, and contradicted each other about the alleged extortion, on which matter their evidence was not invoked by the "partie civile."

Boghos Bedinkian and Ohannes, whose evidence was invoked by the "partie civile," Migherditch, in support of the charge of extortion, could give no evidence on this matter. Ohannes said that two years and a-half ago, in the season of Kasim (?), he was sitting in his room one night, when, about half-past 4 o'clock, he looked out and saw a crowd, and went out of his room, and saw at Migherditch's house, which is 200 adems (paces) distant, Moussa Bey, with his brother-in-law, Amr Bey, and Murad, and some others whom he did not know, boring with picks the stone wall of the house, which was an arshin thick, and hearing them say, "Be off, or we will burn you!" he ran off back to his room; and then from the distance of 200 adems he saw them in the night working for ten minutes or a quarter of an hour at this stone wall an arshin thick, till they made a hole half-a-fathom high, and then Amr Bey first, and next Murad, entered the house by the hole, and afterwards he saw them come out by the hole with the property which they had taken, Amr Bey coming out first, and then Murad, and after the two had come out, Moussa Bey came down from the roof, and then the whole party went off, and when they had gone the villagers came to Migherditch's house and looked at it; and he had nothing else to say against Moussa Bey.

Boghos Vartanian said that, two and a-half years ago, about half-past 4 on a night in October, which he could not fix, when the people in Migherditch's house were asleep, he with an Ohannes, surnamed Onan, who has been already mentioned, and two other persons, were going about the village; that they went into Migherditch's room to rest, and while sitting there he (the witness) heard the dogs barking, and saying, "What is happening in the street?" he went out with Ohannes, and saw on the roof of the house near Migherditch's room a man breaking in the roof with a club which he had in his hand; and he cried out to the man two or three times, "Who are you?" but the man did not answer, and the man then said, "Be silent, or I will burn you (or it)!" and he knew it was Moussa Bey from the voice and from the face, and then being alarmed he passed over to the other side of the road, and saw seven more men, and of these some got into the house by the roof, and afterwards came out by the hole, taking with them things from inside, and then all went off together with the things they had taken, and when they had gone he woke up the inmates of the house, and told them what had happened, and then went back to his own room, and none of his companions who were in his room with him saw the robbers.

Thus these witnesses, Ohannes and Boghos, contradict each other.

According to the communication No. 32 addressed to the Ministry of Justice by the officer of Public Prosecutor of Bitlis, and dated the 30th August, 1305, Ohannes, father of Migherditch, previously brought a complaint before the Court of Moosh, alleging that his barn and hay and other property were burnt on the night of the 16th July, 1303, but whether by Moussa Bey or by one of his relatives, Suleiman Bey, he did not know; and he failed to prove his charge against either Moussa Bey or Suleiman Bey. Now, Migherditch says he saw with his own eyes Moussa Bey set fire to the barn, hay, &c., though Migherditch was at Bitlis on the night of the fire.

The evidence thus appearing contradictory and inconsistent, it is decided, in accordance with the 123rd Article of the Code of Criminal Procedure, that the trial of Moussa Bey shall not be proceeded with.

25th of month Safar, 1307.

Record of the Proceedings before the "Juge d'Instruction" in the case of the Charge preferred against Moussa Bey by Koumash of murdering her husband, Malkhass, miller, of the Village of Ardank, together with the Report of the Public Prosecutor of the Court of First Instance, and the decision of the "Juge d'Instruction" on the case.

Evidence before the "Juge d'Instruction" of Koumash Aruhakian, a Woman aged 25, of the Village of Ardank (date, 27th September, 1305).

(The evidence was given through the sworn interpreter, Bogdik Effendi, clerk in the office of the "Juge d'Instruction." Registrar of the Court, Ahmed.)

Q. What is your charge against the Kurd, Moussa Bey?—*A.* About two and a-half or three years ago, in the month of January, one Sunday evening about 11 o'clock, my husband was coming home from his mill, and had not yet reached the village, and was passing between some stables, when Moussa Bey, who was going by with his men, shot him and wounded him, so that he died an hour after he had reached home.

Q. Did any one see Moussa Bey shoot your husband?—*A.* My husband was coming home from his mill, and I do not know whether any one was with him or not; but the Papases Kaspar and Timar saw Moussa Bey shoot my husband, and so did all the villagers.

Q. Where are the Papases Kaspar and Timar now?—*A.* We came together, and they are in the house below (?).

Q. When did you come to Stamboul, and did the two Papases come with you?—*A.* I came forty or fifty days ago with Miro and another man of Moosh, and the two Papases came with us.

Q. Did you inform the authorities of the fact, that Moussa Bey had shot your husband, and was there an inquiry?—*A.* We were afraid to tell the authorities, and there was no inquiry. Lately a notice has come to us from the Moosh Court, but no one came to ask us questions.

Q. Did they bury your husband without any inquiry?—*A.* Moussa Bey called the Papases and made them bury him without inquiry being held, and then Moussa Bey went away.

Q. Was Moussa Bey stopping in your village at the time?—*A.* Moussa Bey was stopping at Khunar, a village at an hour's distance from our village.

Q. When did Moussa Bey come to your village?—*A.* He came from Khunar with his men at about 11 o'clock, and having murdered my husband went away. I did not see it; I was in my house. I tell what I have heard.

Q. You said that Moussa Bey took the Papases and made them bury your husband. You now say that having killed your husband, he thereupon went away to Khunar.—*A.* Moussa Bey spent the night in the house of one of the chief men of the village. I do not know in whose house. In the morning he sent to our house two men whom I do not know, and the two Papases, and these four took my husband's corpse and buried it. Moussa Bey did not come to our house.

Q. Where was your husband wounded?—*A.* I do not know whether on the right or left hip-bone. The bullet hit the inside of the hip-bone and passed out on the outside, and broke the bone.

Q. Did he walk to his house?—*A.* Some villagers carried him on their backs, but who carried him I do not know.

Q. How far is the place where he was shot from the village?—*A.* About 100 adems (paces).

Q. How many men were there with Moussa Bey?—*A.* I was in my house. I do not know how many.

Q. What was Moussa Bey's business? What did he come to the village for?—*A.* Moussa Bey is always coming to our village.

Q. Had Moussa Bey a quarrel with your husband? Why did he shoot him?—*A.* There was no quarrel. He shot him for amusement. My husband was not one of the Chiefs, nor one of the great men of the village.

Q. Is a man shot for amusement?—*A.* Moussa Bey admitted at Moosh that he had shot my husband not intentionally, but by accident or mistake. He said to me, "I shot your husband by accident, not intentionally." To appease me he brought an Armenian girl, and gave her to my son to be his wife.

Q. According to your evidence, Moussa Bey when tried at Moosh said he had killed your husband by accident?—*A.* He said, "I have my eye on you; don't send your son." At that time I brought no charge, and we did not go before the Moosh Court.

Q. Did Moussa Bey really kill your husband by accident?—*A.* I do not know whether it was intentionally or by accident. All I know is that the villagers brought my husband wounded to our house, and said Moussa Bey had shot him.

Q. Did Moussa Bey shoot your husband and then have him buried, and then get your son a wife?—*A.* He did it to stop me from making a charge against him.

Q. Did Moussa Bey pay attention to you afterwards?—*A.* He did not; and I do not know whether he gave my son money or not; but he got him a wife, and then went away.

Q. Where is your son now?—*A.* In our village.

Q. Is he bringing a charge against Moussa Bey?—*A.* He is; but he is stopping behind to look after the household affairs, and I have come instead.

Q. How old was your son at the time when your husband was shot?—*A.* 12 or 13.

Q. Have you an elder son?—*A.* I have no other son. I have a daughter of 3.

Q. How far is your village from Moosh?—*A.* A day's journey.

Q. Is there not a Kaïmakam or a Mudir near Moosh?—*A.* I do not know.

Q. When Moussa Bey had shot your husband, why did you not bring the charge against him at the time?—*A.* I did not charge him then. I am now bringing the charge because I have heard that the authorities are calling for the accusers of Moussa Bey. I am far from home, and, besides my children, there is no one in my house.

Q. Is not Moosh nearer than Stamboul?—*A.* The officials at Moosh are Moussa Bey's men; they will not listen to us; therefore I have come here.

Q. These witnesses whom you have mentioned, will they give evidence of how your husband was shot or of his wounds?—*A.* These two Papases were talking together when Moussa Bey passed close by them. They then saw my husband come by, and Moussa Bey shoot him. Moussa Bey said to them, "Do not say a word." These are the two Papases who came next morning to bury my husband.

Q. Did any one else but the two Papases see the deed?—*A.* All the villagers who were about saw it.

Q. Can you not tell us the names of some of them?—*A.* I was in my house, and do not know who saw it. I cannot tell you the names.

Q. Did you bring the two Papases here?—*A.* I bore the expense of their coming here. I borrowed money for it.

Q. As the whole village saw it, you might have brought some other men at small expense. Why did you bring the Papases?—*A.* Are the villagers to come and leave their people helpless? I have brought the Papases.

Q. How did you know the Papases saw the facts?—*A.* The Papases said so.

Q. Was it while they were on their way to Stamboul that the Papases said they could give evidence of the facts?—*A.* They said so on the day of the murder.

Q. How old was your husband?—*A.* He was a middle-aged man.

Q. Do you accuse Moussa Bey in order to have him executed, or in order to get compensation from him?—*A.* The Government knows. What have I to say to it?

Q. Will you sign your deposition?—*A.* I do not know how to write; I press my seal.

(Seal of Koumash.)

(Signed) Bogdik, *Interpreter.*
Hussein Sadki, *Juge d'Instruction.*
Ahmed, *Registrar.*

Evidence of Papas Kaspar Mussian, aged 40, of the Village of Ardank, in the Sandjak of Moosh (date, 30th September, 1305).

Q. When did you come to Stamboul?—*A.* From fifty to fifty-five days ago.

Q. Why did you come?—*A.* To give evidence.

Q. Did you come at your own expense?—*A.* At Koumash's expense.

Q. Tell us what you know?—*A.* About two and a-half years ago, in what month and on what day I cannot recollect, at about 11 o'clock in the evening, I went to the barn of the Papas Timar, and asked him to pay me 5 piastres. While I was there Moussa Bey came and sat in a hollow place opposite us, at a distance of from 15 to 20 paces. He was alone, and had in his hand a gun. We said, "How is this? What game can he find?" I looked and saw three men coming from the mill. Moussa Bey fired his

gun and shot one of the men. When Moussa Bey fired the three men were at a distance of four or five minutes' walk from the hollow place where Moussa Bey was sitting. The man who was shot fell down. We said, "Is it an Armenian or a Mussulman?" Moussa Bey told us to be silent, and got up and went away. Some villagers took the wounded man, who was Malkhass, on their backs, and carried him off. He did not speak. An hour afterwards he died. The dead man was left that night in his house. Moussa Bey spent the night in the village. In the morning, Moussa Bey called me and the monk Timar and told us to bury the corpse, and to say nothing of what has happened. We said, "We must inform the authorities before burying the corpse." He said, "Say nothing; keep the matter close or I shall kill you, as I have done this man." We, being afraid, buried the man, and gave no information to the authorities. Moussa mounted his horse and went away home. Ten days afterwards he sent for Malkhass' son, and gave him an Armenian girl as a wife, and Moussa came with them to our village, and had them married there. The authorities were afterwards informed of this. We do not know what happened next, but Malkhass' son did not go to give information to the authorities.

Inclosure 3 in No. 106.

Continuation of Declaration on Oath of the Priest, Gaspar Movsassian, of Village of Ardank, in Sandjak of Moosh, 40 years of age, and residing in Vezir Han when called upon to give Evidence.

Q. Why didn't you report the matter to the authorities?—*A.* Moussa said, "I'll kill you also;" that's why I didn't give information.

Q. Don't you know that it is forbidden to bury the body of a murdered man without giving notice to the authorities, and having an investigation?—*A.* Moussa Bey told us to hush up the matter. It was owing to our fears that we buried the body without giving notice and having the matter examined.

Q. Was there any kind of enmity, or ill-feeling, or personal spite between Moussa Bey and Malkhass?—*A.* I can't say there was.

Q. You didn't ask Moussa Bey why he shot Malkhass?—*A.* No.

Q. Does Moussa Bey shoot any one just as he likes?—*A.* I don't know, but this is what we saw.

Q. Did Moussa Bey shoot any one else from your village?—*A.* No.

Q. But we want to know his reason for shooting this man; you are of same village, and must know?—*A.* I don't know; I only state what I saw.

Q. But the Government wants to know because no notice was given, and the matter not looked into?—*A.* I only know what I say—nothing else. If I knew it I'd say it. I don't know.

Q. Was it threshing-time when Malkhass was killed?—*A.* It was winter.

Q. You say that the priest, Demetre, was in the barn that day?—*A.* I went to his house. "He is in the barn," they said. The barn was near his house, so I went, found him, and asked him for 5 piastres. This affair occurred then; he remained, and did not give me the money.

Q. What was the priest, Demetre, doing in the barn during winter?—*A.* I don't know. They said he was in the barn. I went there and found him.

Q. Was it to get a debt he owed you?—*A.* No; I wanted to borrow it.

Q. Who told the villagers that Malkhass had been shot?—*A.* They were on their roofs. They saw the affair, and went and took away the body.

Q. Do you remain on the roofs during winter?—*A.* During winter no one goes out; only sometimes people go on the roof to sweep the snow away.

Q. Was there snow the winter you speak of?—*A.* It was winter, but I don't know if there was snow or not.

Q. In your country, is there any part of winter without snow?—*A.* We have snow always during winter, but people go on the roofs to sweep it off.

Q. The night Malkhass was shot, in whose house did Moussa Bey stop?—*A.* I don't know; he sent for us from Malkhass' house. Whether he stopped there or not I can't say.

Q. Do you know of any other misdeeds of Moussa Bey?—*A.* No.

Q. Sign this statement.—*A.* I sign.

(Signature in Armenian.)

(Signed) Hussein Sadki, *Juge d'Instruction.*
Ahmet, *Clerk.*

Statement of Priest, Demetre Khalefatian, who, when summoned to give Evidence, gave himself out as of the Village of Ardank, in Sandjak of Moosh, 34 or 35 years of age, and now residing in Vezir Han.

Q. When did you come to Constantinople?—*A.* About the 15th August.

Q. Why did you come?—*A.* To give evidence.

Q. At your own expense?—*A.* At expense of wife of Malkhass.

Q. What do you know?—*A.* Some two years and eight months ago, about 11 o'clock on a Sunday evening, I was in a barn in front of my house, when the priest, Gaspar, came and wanted to borrow 5 piastres from me. While we were talking Moussa Bey came along alone, passed us, and got down into a ditch behind the shed. He carried a gun over his shoulder. The ditch was about 5 paces from us. I got up and went to look. He aimed the gun in the direction of the mill, and Malkhass was coming from that direction. He fired the gun, and Malkhass was wounded. I said to myself, "I wonder if the wounded man is an Armenian or a Turk?" Moussa Bey told us to say nothing about it. Neither did we. He then went to our village. The villagers were all on their roofs. They came, picked up Malkhass, and carried him home. An hour after he died. The body remained in the house that night. Moussa Bey stopped at the house of Mardiros, and in the morning summoned us to his house. "Remove this corpse," he said. I replied, "I won't remove it till I give notice to the authorities." "If you don't I will kill you," he replied. We became afraid, and buried it. We then went home. We had scarcely arrived when Moussa Bey again sent for us. He also sent for the son of Malkhass and said to him, "If you make any complaint you will regret it." "I won't complain," said the son, "If you don't complain," said Moussa Bey, "I'll be a friend to you." He got up and went home. Ten days after he summoned Malkhass' son again to his own house, and gave him an Armenian girl. They came to our village, got married, and went off to Moussa Bey's village. A few days after the authorities heard of the matter and sent for Malkhass' son; Moussa Bey, taking the son with him, went to Moosh. I don't know what happened after that.

Q. Was Malkhass alone when coming from the mill?—*A.* There were three other persons with him. But, as it was foggy and they were about 200 or 250 yards off, we could not recognize them.

Q. Where did these men go when Malkhass was shot?—*A.* They came to the village.

Q. Was Moussa Bey on horseback or on foot?—*A.* About an hour before the occurrence he came to the village and tied his horse up at the house of Mardiros. When he passed us he was on foot.

Q. Where was Malkhass wounded?—*A.* The bullet entered the inside of the right thigh and out on the outside.

Q. Is Moussa Bey's village near yours?—*A.* About an hour's distance.

Q. Is your house in the village?—*A.* On the outskirts of it.

Q. What were you doing in the barn during winter?—*A.* The shed is near the barn. I went to take out some hay and straw.

Q. Was not the priest, Gaspar, with you in the barn?—*A.* Yes.

Q. You say he asked you for money. Did you give it?—*A.* I had no money about me in the barn; when I went home I gave it to him.

Q. How long after?—*A.* After Malkhass was shot we went home, and I gave him the money.

Q. You say the people were on the roofs that day. Was it not winter?—*A.* Even during winter we go on the roofs, and sit there amusing ourselves.

Q. Was there not snow?—*A.* We sweep it off, and don't let it lie on the roofs.

Q. Why did Moussa Bey shoot Malkhass? What was the reason?—*A.* I don't know.

Q. When he was shot he ought not to have been buried before being examined. The law lays down a penalty for those who bury the body of a murdered man without such examination?—*A.* We didn't give notice; we were afraid. The punishment of the law is temporary. Moussa Bey's punishment is death.

Q. Did Moussa Bey kill any one else from your village?—*A.* I don't know.

Q. Do you know of any other crime of his?—*A.* No.

Q. To kill a man there must be some cause. Was there any ill-feeling?—*A.* I don't know of any motive for it.

Q. At any rate, you could have secretly informed the Government.—*A.* That's not my affair. That's the duty of the heirs of the murdered man.

Q. Sign this declaration.—*A.* I sign.

(Signature in Armenian.)

(Signed) HUSSEIN SADKI, *Juge d'Instruction.*
AHMET, *Clerk.*

Second Statement of Gaspar on 30th September, 1305.

Q. In the Statement you made lately, you said you saw two men with Malkhass when he was shot. Who were they?—*A.* I don't know.

Q. When he was shot where did these men go?—*A.* They came to the village, but I don't know who they were.

Q. Was Moussa Bey on horseback or on foot?—*A.* He was on foot when he shot Malkhass.

Q. What's the distance between your village and the village of Moussa Bey?—*A.* About three-quarters of an hour or an hour.

Q. Did Moussa Bey come on horseback to your village?—*A.* According to what I heard, about two hours before the affair, he came with fifteen or twenty horsemen, he being also mounted.

Q. Where was Malkhass wounded?—*A.* He was wounded in the thigh, but I don't remember in which thigh, or where the bullet entered, or where it came out.

Q. You stated you asked the priest, Demetre, for 5 piastres; you said you did not get it owing to this event. Did you get it afterwards?—*A.* I don't remember.

Q. Sign this statement.—*A.* I sign.

(Signature in Armenian.)

(Signed) HUSSEIN SADKI, *Juge d'Instruction.*
AHMET, *Clerk.*

Interrogatory and Declaration of Defendant, Moussa Bey, given on 2nd October, 1305.

Q. What is your name, your father's name, country, and occupation?—*A.* My name is Moussa Bey. My father's name, Mirza Bey. I come from village of Jinyar, in Sandjak of Moosh. I was born there. I am 30 or 35 years of age. I was Mudir for a time, and live by farming taxes. I am married; have three wives, two sons, and two daughters, five farms, and a house.

Q. Is Ardank near your village?—*A.* A couple of hours' distance.

Q. Do you often go to the village?—*A.* Yes.

Q. In this village there was a man named Malkhass. Do you know him?—*A.* No; I don't know him.

Q. You must know him, for you married his son?—*A.* I don't know his father. I never saw him. His son married a girl from our village. I was at the marriage.

Q. It was you gave the girl, and got the son of Malkhass married?—*A.* The girl's father came to me, saying, "Such a youth wants to marry my daughter. Shall I give her?" "If it seems a good match, give her," I replied. The marriage took place. I was present, as it is a custom of ours. If we have a marriage, they come; if they have one, we are present.

Q. You are charged with shooting Malkhass, the father of this young man, a few days before the marriage?—*A.* No; I did not shoot him.

Q. According to depositions made, you shot him when returning from the mill with a couple of comrades?—*A.* If such were the case, the authorities would have heard of it and prosecuted me. No such thing ever took place.

Q. Who killed Malkhass?—*A.* He died a natural death. A year after some Armenians who disliked me went to the authorities and said I killed Malkhass. Thereupon the judicial authorities summoned to Moosh Malkhass' brother, the priest, and Malkhass' son. They were asked about the matter, and declared no such thing ever took place, and that Malkhass died a natural death.

Q. The priests, Gaspar and Demetre, assert that Malkhass was shot by a bullet by you?—*A.* The priest, Gaspar, is a cousin of Malkhass'; Demetre is also a cousin of Ohannes, father of Migherditch, of Ardank, who brought an action against me.

Q. If no such thing ever took place, *i.e.*, if you never shot Malkhass, would they give such evidence?—*A.* Ohannes, father of Migherditch, is the steward of Ardank.

They make these charges at the instigation of Ohannes and another prosecutor of me, Bozun.

Q. Did the priest, the brother of Malkhass, go to Moosh?—The Government of Moosh heard of matter, summoned these people, and took their statements. If I shot Malkhass, is it possible that out of a village of thirty or forty houses only these priests should have seen it?

Q. Sign this statement?—*A.* I sign.

MOUSSA SABHIT.

(Signed) HUSSEIN SADKI, *Juge d'Instruction.*
AHMET, *Clerk.*

Second Declaration of Gaspar, taken 4th October, 1305.

Q. Is there any brother of the deceased Malkhass?—*A.* No.

Q. According to Moussa Bey there was a priest, the brother of Malkhass?—*A.* There is a priest called Gabriel, a relative of Malkhass.

Q. Are you related to Malkhass?—*A.* No.

Q. Where is Gabriel?—*A.* In his village.

Q. Moussa Bey states that you are the cousin of Malkhass?—*A.* I am no relation of his.

Q. You stated that the day following the murder of Malkhass, Moussa Bey called you to house of Malkhass, and made you bury the body, whereas the priest, Demetre, says Moussa Bey sent for you to house of Migherditch?—*A.* No. Moussa Bey sent for us to Malkhass' house, not Migherditch's.

Q. The priest, Demetre, says that Moussa Bey spent that night in Migherditch's house, and in the morning summoned you there?—*A.* I don't know where Moussa Bey spent the night. In the morning he summoned us to Malkhass' house.

Q. Moussa Bey says that a year after the event, owing to some ill-feeling against him, false reports reached the Government, whereupon the authorities summoned Malkhass' son and the priest you speak of, asked them if Malkhass had been killed by Moussa Bey. They said he had not, but had died a natural death?—*A.* There is no information from them. I am only giving my own evidence.

Q. Do you know of any other crimes of Moussa Bey besides this?—*A.* No.

Q.—Do you know of his having killed any man, or seized the goods, oxen, or other property of any one in the village?—*A.* I don't know.

Q. Sign this statement?—*A.* I sign.

(Signature in Armenian.)

(Signed) HUSSEIN SADKI, *Juge d'Instruction.*
AHMET, *Clerk.*

Second Statement of the Priest, Demetre, 4th October, 1305.

Q. Is there any brother of the deceased Malkhass?—*A.* No; none.

Q. According to Moussa Bey, Malkhass had a brother, a priest?—*A.* He had a relative a priest called Gabriel, but I think he is not his brother; I'm not quite sure.

Q. You are not related to Malkhass?—*A.* No.

Q. Is priest Gaspar related to Malkhass?—*A.* No.

Q. Are you related to the stone-cutter, Migherditch, or the priest, Ohannes?—*A.* No; I am not related to Ohannes.

Q. Gaspar states that the day after Malkhass' death Moussa Bey summoned you to Malkhass' house, and ordered you to bury the body, while you say he summoned you from Migherditch's house; there is some contradiction?—*A.* Moussa Bey spent that night in Migherditch's house, and it was there he summoned us in the morning; then taking us, he brought us to Malkhass' house.

Q. Moussa Bey says that a year after Malkhass' death, owing to some ill-feeling against him, false information was given to the authorities, whereupon they summoned Malkhass' son and a priest, a relative of Malkhass. On being questioned as to whether Malkhass had been killed by Moussa, they declared that he had not, but had died a natural death?—*A.* It wasn't a year after Malkhass' death, but a few days after, that the authorities heard of the matter and summoned the son of Malkhass. Moussa Bey went along with him, but what statements they made I don't know.

Q. I wonder did the son say his father had died a natural death?—*A.* I have not heard, and don't know what statements they made.

Q. Besides the events you relate, did Moussa Bey commit any other crime? Did he kill any one of your village, or seize their property?—*A.* I make this statement, and know of no other.

Q. Sign this statement.—*A.* I sign.

(Signature in Armenian.)

(Signed) Hussein Sadki, *Juge d'Instruction.*
Ahmet, *Clerk.*

Copy of the Report.

Owing to a complaint by the woman, Koumash Benet Ouruh, of village of Ardank, that Moussa Bey had wounded and killed her husband, Malkhass Arsbanian, of the same village, an examination has taken place of the detailed interrogatory containing the investigations which, on a previous demand, were instituted concerning the defendant, the Kurd, Moussa Bey.

As a perusal of these documents will show, the defendant pleads not guilty, while Koumash declares that she brought her action against Moussa Bey without having seen whether her husband was wounded accidentally or designedly; merely asserts that they brought her husband home wounded, and said that Moussa Bey had wounded him; that he died of his wounds, and was buried without notice to the authorities or any investigation taking place; while the witnesses, Gaspar and Demetre, depose on oath that they saw this man Malkhass, while coming to the village from the mill, shot and killed by a bullet from a gun fired by Moussa Bey; and, thus, while in the statements of these witnesses there are contradictions and discrepancies in the record of the interrogatory to be found among the documents coming from the province, according to the signed and duly received declarations of Malkhass's on, and the priest, Gabriel, a relative of the deceased, it appears that Malkhass was not wounded and killed, but died a natural death. Though the depositions made cannot be regarded as trustworthy or reliable testimony, yet, as the consideration of this side of the question rests with the higher Court, and as the crime imputed is one coming under the 170th clause of the Criminal Code, with a view to having the proper course followed in the higher Court, it is demanded that, in accordance with the 128th clause of the Criminal Code, a decision on the matter should be formally drawn up.

Proctor-General of the "Cour de Mise en Accusation" at Constantinople.
23*rd Reby-ul-Ewel*, 1307 (6*th October*, 1305).

Decision of Juge d'Instruction.

This complaint has been examined into on the summons of the Proctor-General of Constantinople ("Cour de Mise en Accusation," dated 21st September, 1305), in reference to the wounding and murder by the Kurd, Moussa Bey, of a miller living at Ardank, in Sandjak of Moosh, a complaint presented on the 20th September, 1305, and signed by the murdered man's wife, Koumash, of village of Ardank, now living in Millet Han, has been forwarded to the Court of Preliminary Inquiry.

As appears on perusal, this complaint consists of statement that some thirty months ago, one day towards evening, about 11 o'clock, Moussa Bey came to village of Ardank, fired at and shot Malkhass as he was coming from his mill; that Gaspar and Pemar, two priests of the village, and who had knowledge of the affair, had come to Constantinople to appear as witnesses. They had been summoned, the necessary investigation gone through, and this was their complaint. The complainant, the woman Koumash, had come to the Court of Preliminary Inquiry on the 28th September, 1305, and when, with Bagdik Effendi acting as interpreter, she was asked the date and nature of the affair, deposed as follows:—That about two and a-half years ago, towards 11 o'clock of a Sunday evening in end of January, when her husband was coming from mill, and Moussa with some horsemen was passing near the stables, Moussa Bey shot and wounded her husband, who died an hour after reaching home; that she did not know who were the men with her husband when coming from the mill, or who or what were the villagers who carried him home on their backs; that she did not see Moussa Bey wounded, but merely stated what she heard; that the priests, Gaspar and Demetre, and all the villagers, whose names she did not know, had seen the affair;

that the following day Moussa Bey, sending the two priests with two persons whom she did not know, made them bury the body; that Moussa Bey had not come to their houses; that, though the bullet fired by Moussa Bey had entered the thigh of the deceased on the inside and came out on the outside, she could not say whether it was the right or left thigh that was struck; that while, owing to their not having given notice to authorities on account of their fears, no examination of deceased had taken place. Moussa Bey acknowledged that he had wounded the dead man, accidentally however, and not purposely, and had even said, "I did not wish to wound your husband; it was an accident;" that to please her he had given an Armenian girl of his village to her son, and got them married; and finally, that there was no enmity between her husband and Moussa Bey.

Moussa Bey, being also summoned and examined, deposed that he was son of Mirza Bey, of Jinyar Village, in Sandjak of Moosh, and, denying absolutely having wounded and killed Malkhass, said that he had understood him to have died a natural death; that the priest, Gaspar, was cousin to the deceased, while Demetre was cousin to Ohannes, the father of Migherditch, of Ardank, and one of those who had brought an action against him; that, as it was a custom when they (Turks) had a marriage to invite the villagers, and when villagers had a marriage to invite them, he was present at the marriage of Malkhass' son, on the invitation of the bride's father.

The priests, Gaspar and Demetre, were also summoned and examined, and their deposition on oath taken. Gaspar deposed that, some two and a-half years ago—he couldn't remember month or day—about 11 o'clock, he went to the barn of Demetre and asked him for 5 piastres, which he wanted. They saw Moussa Bey alone, and with a gun in his hand, lie in a ditch about 15 or 20 paces off. While they were wondering what he was going to shoot, they saw three men coming from a mill, which was about five minutes' distance. The bullet from the gun fired by Moussa Bey struck one of the men, and he fell wounded. As they were wondering whether it was an Armenian or Turk, Moussa Bey said, "Say nothing about it," and, getting up, he went away. Then the villagers, who were on the roofs and saw the affair, taking Malkhass on their backs, brought him home. The wounded man died an hour afterwards. This prevented Gaspar getting his 5 piastres from Demetre, and he couldn't remember whether he got it afterwards. He also didn't know in whose house Moussa Bey stayed that night, though he stopped in the village.

The following morning Moussa Bey summoned him and priest Demetre to Malkhass' house, and told them to remove the body, threatening them, if they did not, to kill them also; that in consequence, taking the body, they buried it without giving notice to authorities or the examination taking place. Then, about ten days after the burial, Moussa Bey going to his house, called the son of Malkhass, and, giving him an Armenian girl, they came to the village and got married. Afterwards, when the authorities heard of the matter, they sent for the son of Malkhass; but Moussa Bey took him away, and did not go near the authorities. Gaspar said he did not know the men who were near the murdered man when coming from the mill, as also that he could not remember in which thigh Malkhass was wounded, where the bullet entered, and where it came out, that he was no relation to Malkhass, and, though it was winter, said he was in the barn of the priest Demetre.

The priest Demetre deposed that some two years and eight months ago, on a Sunday evening in the month of February, about 11 o'clock, when he was in his barn in front of his house, Gaspar came and asked him for loan of 5 piastres. While they were talking over it Moussa Bey, alone, and with a gun on his shoulder, came up, passed, and got down into a ditch behind the shed and about five paces from where they were standing. He (Demetre) went near him, and saw Moussa Bey hold his gun in direction of the mill, while Malkhass was coming from that side. Moussa fired, and Malkhass was wounded. As he was asking himself whether the wounded man was an Armenian or Turk, Moussa, making signs with his hand, told him to keep quiet; then getting up, he went to the village. The villagers, who were all on their roofs and saw Malkhass wounded, came and carried him home. An hour after Malkhass died. That night Moussa Bey slept in the village in house of Mardiros, and in the morning, summoning them to Mardiros' house, threatened them, and made them bury the body.

After the burial, Moussa again summoned them and Malkhass' son to Mardiros' house, and said to the youth, "If you make any complaint, you will regret it." The son, frightened, said he would make no complaint. Then Moussa said, "If you don't complain, I will be your friend." Then he went home. About ten days after he called Malkhass' son to his house, and gave him an Armenian girl. They, coming to

the village, got married. Some days after the authorities heard about it, and summoned Malkhass' son, but Moussa took him off to Moosh. Demetre said also that, though there were some persons with Malkhass when coming from the mill, he could not recognize them as it was foggy, and they were about 150 or 200 paces off; that the bullet had penetrated on the inner side of the right thigh and come out on the outside; that he was in the barn, because he wanted to take straw from a shed which was near; that, as he had no money about him in the barn, he had not given any to Gaspar, but that they afterwards went home, and he gave the 5 piastres; that he did not know any cause for the crime.

As a result of a discussion which took place on the 5th October, 1305, it was shown to the Proctor-General of the Court of Preliminary Inquiry that it was necessary to send for documents containing an account of the investigations carried on in the province. Accordingly these documents, consisting of an "information," a Petition, and two interrogatories, arrived on the 26th October, and were handed over to the Court of Inquiry. On examination, the purport of the "information," dated the 19th February, 1302, and signed by priest Gabriel, and Usseb, son of Malkhass, goes to say that Malkhass, who was 60 years of age, had been wounded in the right thigh ten days before, that no report of a gun had been heard, and that a rumour was among the people that he had been struck by a thunderbolt.

In the depositions taken from Gabriel and Usseb in the province, the latter stated that when his father was coming from the mill, and behind him were a band of Marauk Kurds and Moussa Bey's servants were on the roof, a bullet coming from some direction or other wounded his father in the foot; that as he did not die from the effects of that wound, no notice had been given to the authorities for an examination; that on news received from them, Moussa Bey sent some people to find the wounded man, but could not find out who he was; that Gabriel was the cousin of the deceased, and if there were any signs of his being wounded in the right foot, it was not enough to cause his death; that as his heirs gave out that he had died of illness, he himself had buried the body; and they stated that it was not known by whom he was wounded. So, too, Usseb, in a complaint lodged with the Proctor-General of Moosh on the 17th March, 1304, and in subsequent statement made by him to the Juge d'Instruction of Moosh, declared that he had heard that the charge of murdering his father had been got up by some persons who had an ill-feeling towards Moussa, whereas his father, after being ill in bed for some ten days, died a natural death; that Moussa Bey had nothing whatsoever to do with it; that he himself, though urged on by some Armenians to prefer a charge against Moussa, had refused to mix himself up in such calumnies.

From the above details it will appear that, while the priests, Gaspar and Demetre, stated that Moussa Bey was alone when he killed and wounded Malkhass, the complainant, Koumash, had stated that her husband had been wounded when he was coming from the mill, and Moussa with some men were passing between the stables, and had made statements that hinted at his being wounded by accident or mistake. Now, these statements are contradictory. And again, when they stated that at the time of the wounding there were two or three comrades with him; that the wounded man was taken up and carried home by the villagers, who were on the roofs and saw the events, if these statements were true.

(To be continued.)

No. 107.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received December* 25.)

(No. 500. Secret.)
My Lord, *Constantinople, December* 17, 1889.

YOUR Lordship was kind enough to approve by your despatch No. 396 of the 6th instant of my having communicated to the Grand Vizier a Memorandum, calling his Highness' attention to certain irregularities with regard to the preliminary stages in the investigation as to Moussa Bey, who has since been acquitted.

I should not have felt it necessary to refer to that Memorandum again if its presentation had not been the occasion, as I have since learned, secretly, of an allusion at the Palace in a sense hostile both to myself and to the Grand Vizier.

I have been told that it was represented there as an interference on the part of a foreign Ambassador with the course of justice. The Grand Vizier found it easy, I believe, to set the matter right.

It may be useful that I should here explain to your Lordship that this trial has become the occasion of a most active intrigue at the Palace against Her Majesty's Embassy.

It has been represented to the Sultan that our interest in the conviction of Moussa Bey was to be ascribed to the desire of Her Majesty's Government to raise the whole Armenian question in a way disagreeable to the Sultan, and knowing how His Imperial Majesty is sensitive on this point, no effort was spared to persuade him that it was for his interest that Moussa Bey should, if possible, be acquitted.

The representatives of the Kurdish clan hold considerable influence at the Palace, and they have all warmly taken up the cause of their criminal Chieftain, even going so far as to represent to His Majesty that if he were to sacrifice Moussa to the Giaours, a massacre would be sure to take place in Kurdistan, which would just bring on the calamities which His Majesty wanted to avert for his Empire, by Moussa's trial and condemnation.

Your Lordship will be best able to judge, from this slight indication, of the prudence and tact which the conduct of this business has required, and the worry it has caused me by the unsatisfactory turn it has taken.

In another despatch, I shall have the honour to point out the efforts I have made since the 2nd instant to prevent the ends of justice being entirely frustrated by this fellow's liberation.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

No. 108.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received December* 27.)

(No. 501.)
My Lord, *Constantinople, December* 17, 1889.

IT may be useful and convenient to your Lordship to have in a few words what I consider to be the irregularities which took place during the course of the investigation into the charges against Moussa Bey and during his trial.

They can be divided into three heads. The first, which is of the least importance, is that during the "Instruction" reports were frequently brought to me that, whilst Moussa Bey was most courteously treated, and received rather as a distinguished guest than as a man accused of the gravest crimes, the Armenian prosecutors and witnesses were treated with contumely, and advantage was taken of their inadequate education and native simplicity to confuse and browbeat them. Unofficially, I made repeated representations to the Ministry of Justice on this point, but the complaints were always denied. The unwillingness, however, of the "Juge d'Instruction" to commit Moussa for trial was clearly proved by the fact, that in the five cases which may be considered now to have been disposed of he gave an "Ordonnance de Non-Lieu," and it was only on appeal being made by the prosecutors' lawyers in three cases that this decision was reversed in two of them, which were set down for trial.

The second point is, that after Moussa was committed he should, according to all precedent (though, according to a new theory of the Ministry of Justice, this is not necessary, even in criminal cases), have been under arrest. In reply to my unofficial representations, I always received a reply that he was under arrest; but, as a matter of fact, this arrest was illusory, and Moussa's comparative liberty until after the second day of the trial, which fact was no doubt publicly known, probably had a disheartening effect on the plaintiffs, their lawyers, and their witnesses.

The third and most striking point is the position taken up by the Public Prosecutor, and this point having been already fully dealt with in my despatches Nos. 485 and 493 of the 6th and 7th instant, I need not weary your Lordship with a recapitulation thereof. Suffice it to say, that the position taken up by him savoured rather of that of a lawyer for the defence than of a prosecutor on behalf of the Government, and it is generally considered as unprecedented in the judicial annals of this country.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

No. 109.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received December 27.*)

(No. 509.) *Constantinople, December* 20, 1889.

My Lord,

WITH reference to my despatch No. 500, Secret, of the 17th instant, I have the honour to inclose herewith a translation of an article which has appeared in an influential, though unofficial, Turkish local paper, the "Terjuman-i-Hakikat," on the subject of the recent trial of Moussa Bey. The article, which is evidently ironical, alludes in a somewhat sarcastic manner to the presence of British Dragomans at the trial, and to the interest taken by Her Majesty's Embassy in it, an interest which the writer evidently considers to go beyond the province of Her Majesty's Embassy. This article appears to me to form part of a series of attempts which are being made to prejudice Her Majesty's Embassy and Government in the eyes of the Turkish people, in attributing to us a desire to raise on the question of the trial the whole of the Armenian question, and to which attempts I alluded in my above-mentioned despatch.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 109.

Extract from the "Terjuman-i-Hakikat" of December 6 (18), 1889.

(Translation.)

ACCORDING to information which we have just received on the subject, the Dragomans of the British Embassy have been employed during the last few days in making a fresh translation of the Reports of the proceedings of Moussa Bey's trial.

Although a translation in the form of a précis had previously been prepared and forwarded by the above-mentioned Drogmanat, many Government functionaries and private persons having discovered in most of the articles published in London that this question had a political colouring, expressed the wish to have set before them a literal translation.

For this reason, therefore, the gentlemen of the British Drogmanat are now engaged in making a fresh translation.

We have also been informed that amongst the papers which had published the Reports of this trial, the account given by the "Terjuman-i-Hakikat" was the one which was found both complete and accurate. We have therefore to express our satisfaction, but as it is to the kindness and ability of two gentlemen attached to the Ministry of Justice that we are indebted in this matter, we hasten to express to them our most particular thanks.

However, we derive even greater satisfaction from the fact that the Government of Her Britannic Majesty, on ascertaining the importance of this trial, has desired to be put in possession of a careful translation.

Moreover, as we have said previously in one of our articles, the facts with which Moussa Bey was charged were only offences at common law, but certain people who endeavour to mislead public opinion have importuned the whole of Europe, and England in particular, by wishing to give a political complexion to this affair.

From the outset, we have stated that in the event of Moussa Bey being condemned, the punishment inflicted could only be one directed against an offence at common law, and that if, on the other hand, he succeeded in establishing his innocence, all the charges brought against him would be declared false.

The sittings of the Court were conducted in so public a manner that the hall could not contain all the spectators who overflowed into the passages. Amongst those who were taking notes on the proceedings were the Dragomans of the Embassies and the correspondents of the foreign newspapers.

The investigation into the charges was conducted in a manner thoroughly in conformity with the "Code d'Instruction Criminelle," and the verdict acquitting Moussa Bey was based on the contradictory statements of the witnesses, and the glaring proofs of the false nature of the evidence of most of these witnesses. Even had English Judges, whose impartiality is known all over the world, been present, they would clearly have declared Moussa Bey innocent. We use the word "clearly," for our contention will be proved by the literal translation now being made by the gentlemen

of the British Drogmanat, and the attitude adopted by the British Government in this affair is very praiseworthy.

No. 110.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(*Received December* 27.)

(No. 510. Confidential.)

My Lord, *Constantinople, December* 20, 1889.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 416, Confidential, of the 11th October, I have the honour to inclose herewith the reply of Saïd Pasha to the note addressed to him by Mr. King, Chargé d'Affaires of the United States of America, on the subject of the attack of Moussa Bey on two American missionaries, Messrs. Knapp and Reynolds, in 1883, and also a copy of the answer Mr. King has sent to this communication.

Saïd Pasha treats the serious questions put forward by Mr. King in a somewhat light manner, passing over the charge of the brutal attack said to have been made by Moussa on these gentlemen, and alluding merely to the articles stolen from them, remarking with some naïveté that, as the articles stolen were restored, there was no longer any charge against him. To this note Mr. King has replied in firm terms, again demanding the arrest and punishment of Moussa Bey for this crime.

Mr. King has kindly furnished me with these documents confidentially.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 110.

Saïd Pasha to Mr. King.

M. le Chargé d'Affaires, *Sublime Porte, le* 10 *Décembre*, 1889.

J'AI reçu la note que vous avez bien voulu m'adresser le 7 Octobre dernier relativement à l'affaire du Rio, Mr. Knapp, et du Docteur Reynolds.

Mon collègue de la Justice, auquel j'avais communiqué cette pièce, me fait savoir en réponse qu'il résulte de la correspondance précédemment échangée à ce sujet, avec les autorités judiciaires locales, et dont il a été donné à temps connaissance à la Légation des États-Unis d'Amérique que la plus grande partie des objets soustraits à MM. Knapp et Reynolds leur ont été restitués, et que Moussa Bey et les autres individus qui avaient été arrêtés sous la prévention d'avoir commis ce méfait ont été alors relaxés sur une Ordonnance de Non-Lieu rendue par la Chambre des Mises en Accusation, qui n'avait pu relever aucune charge contre eux.

Son Excellence Djevdet Pasha ajoute dès lors qu'aucune poursuite ne saurait plus être exercée de ce chef contre Moussa Bey.

Agréez, &c.

(Signé) SAÏD.

Inclosure 2 in No. 110.

Mr. King to Saïd Pasha.

United States' Legation, Constantinople,

M. le Ministre, *December* 18, 1889.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's note of the 10th instant, in reply to mine of the 7th October last, regarding the attack of Moussa Bey on two American citizens, Messrs. Knapp and Reynolds.

It is true that his Highness Aarifi Pasha informed Mr. Wallace (28th January, 1884) that Moussa Bey had been released, but his statement that "Dr. Knapp had no grievance against Moussa Bey," is the exact contrary of what has been repeatedly stated to the Sublime Porte, namely, that when Mr. Knapp was confronted with several persons, he picked out Moussa Bey as a man who cut Dr. Reynolds with a sword; and, as stated in my note of the 7th October last, the identification of Moussa

Bey is regarded by my Government as complete, and on that ground his punishment asked for.

In 1884 Mr. Knapp was in Constantinople, and went with Mr. Gargiulo, the Dragoman of this Legation, to see his Excellency the Minister of Justice, and told him that he had identified Moussa Bey.

Not only was this the view taken by my Government, but his Excellency Assini Pasha, in a note to Mr. Wallace (12th January, 1885), admitted that "the inquest made by the Ministry of Justice had revealed certain irregularities committed by the Examing Magistrate and the Deputy Imperial Prosecutor, and that these two Magistrates had been put under Judgment."

And, again, his Excellency Assini Pasha (see note to Mr. Wallace, 6th April, 1885) stated that, while not consenting to a pecuniary indemnity, "it is lawful for the persons interested to bring suit against the Magistrates for prejudice to their cases by reason of irregularities in the proceedings.

And your Excellency in your note to Mr. Cox (12th December, 1885, and compare note 6th February, 1886) stated that you had insisted on a "new and conscientious examination of the affair."

In view of the actual facts in the case, and the admission of the Sublime Porte itself, I am astonished to learn that his Excellency the Minister of Justice should state that no suit can any longer be brought against Moussa Bey for this murderous attack because (as he says), when formerly arrested, no case was found against him.

Permit me to say that the point at issue is not to be settled by statements about the articles or property taken from Messrs. Knapp and Reynolds, to which I did not even allude in my note of the 7th October last. Your Excellency will therefore allow me to repeat and to emphasize the request of my Government, that Moussa Bey be duly punished for this crime.

Accept, &c.
(Signed) PENDLETON KING,
Chargé d'Affaires, ad interim.

No. 111.

Sir W. White to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received December 27.)

(No. 515.)
My Lord, *Constantinople, December* 23, 1889.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 509 of the 20th instant, I have the honour to transmit herewith a translation of an article from the "Tarik" on the subject of the trial of Moussa Bey.

The gist of the article is, as your Lordship will perceive, the assertion that so long as the proceedings have been in conformity with law, *i.e.*, formally legal, the political aspect or interest attaching to the matter is beside the question; but the allusions to the presence of Embassy officials and to the reports alleged to have been sent home by Her Majesty's Embassy are evidently conceived in the same spirit as those to which I have already called your Lordship's attention from the "Hakikat."

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. A. WHITE.

Inclosure in No. 111.

Extract from the "Tarik" of December 20, 1889.

(Translation.)

ALTHOUGH it is not all in accord with our views that matters connected with the administration of justice should be mentioned in leaders on political matters, yet as our contemporary, the "Terjuman-i-Hakikat" has deemed fit, with the object, indeed, of divesting it of a political character, to review the trial of Moussa Bey from a political point of view, and as the fact that the Turkish newspapers have discussed this matter as a political matter will open a new door to those who desire to give the case a political colour, therefore we also have considered it fitting to make a few remarks.

The point which concerns a newspaper, according to our opinion, is not the fact that Moussa Bey has been acquitted or condemned, but whether the judicial institutions of the country have done their duty, or have neglected something in the doing of

it; yet, at the same time, though there is nothing to say against that, there is no need, so far as we see, to enter into detailed examination of the proceedings.

As the performance of their duties regularly by the constituted authorities is sufficient to purify the reputation of the country from the stain of every kind of crime and rascality, even if Moussa Bey had been condemned, in our opinion there could have been no political effect whatever.

Once that we observe that the law has been perfectly complied with, we can attach no importance at all to the Court-room being full, or the reverse, or to the presence or absence of Embassy officials and newspaper correspondents among the audience. We consider that such information should properly come as the introduction and heading to the report of our judicial reporters, and is rather of the character of adorning phrases, just as in newspapers which give information concerning trials in European Courts there are such phrases as: "The ladies' bench was crammed with ladies, and the toilette of one or two high-born dames attracted the attention of young men of fashion."

In all civilized countries all kinds of unjust acts and horrible crimes take place, and, as we showed above, the fact of the judicial authorities doing their duty is a sufficient moral and material remedy for the same, and must we, therefore, fill the political columns of our political journals because certain frivolous talkers give a political colour to such matters?

Of a truth, although we learn from our contemporary, the "Terjuman-i-Hakikat," that the English Embassy is working at a literal translation of the Reports of this trial, yet we need not attach any importance to this fact, for sometimes the Embassies are occupied in doing very unimportant work, and advantage is taken of such things to occupy young Secretaries, who are appointed as pupils; hence there is no need at all to wonder at the news, if true, that a literal translation of an important trial is being made.

Constantinople, December 23, 1889.